

No. 25.

328.94

Au7pa1

[ISSUED SATURDAY, 31ST JULY, 1920.]


 THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARIES
COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA. *Parliament*

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

FIRST SESSION, 1920.

CONTENTS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 23 JULY.		PAGE	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 28 JULY.		PAGE
Personal Explanations	2965		Ministerial Changes	3015	
The Treasurership	2965		Suspension of Member	3015	
High Commissioner	2966		Commonwealth Trading Concerns: Balance-sheets	3015	
Price of Butter	2966		High Commissioner's Office: Cost	3016	
International Postal Conference	2966		Port Adelaide Telephone Applications	3016	
Telephone Material	2966		War Service Homes: Messrs. Kirkpatrick	3016	
War Trophies	2966		War Gratuity Bonds.—Forms—Land Settlement	3016	
Mercantile Marine: War Service	2967		Pacific Mail Contract	3017	
Pan-Pacific Scientific Congress: Representation of Commonwealth	2967		Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League: Control of the Distribution of Soldiers' Tweed	3017	
Price of News Printing Paper	2967		Papers	3017	
Wheat: Payment of Commonwealth Guarantee	2967		Peace Conference Report	3018	
North-South Railway	2967		Dissent from Mr. Deputy Speaker's Ruling	3018	
Naturalization of Foreigners	2968		Institute of Science and Industry Bill	3023	
Congestion of Australian Products in London	2968		Order of Business	3051	
Dairy Produce Pool	2968		Industrial Peace Bill	3051	
Order of Business	2968		Adjournment.—Application of Closure Motion	3051	
Institute of Science and Industry Bill.—Second Reading	2970				
Adjournment.—Wellington Hospital, New South Wales: Mail Delivery	2993				
SENATE, 28 JULY.			SENATE, 29 JULY.		
Public Accounts Committee: Resignation of Members	2993		Papers	3052	
Ministerial Statement: Changes in Cabinet	2994		Defence Force: Pay of Imperial Reservist Officers	3052	
High Commissioner to the United States of America	2994		Corn-sacks: Distribution of Profits	3052	
Repatriation: Case of Mr. H. L. Pratt	2994		War Gratuity Bonds.—Cashing by Life Assurance Societies: Agents' Commission	3052	
Papers	2994		Leave of Absence	3053	
Property of German Internees	2994		Unlawful Assemblies Bill	3053	
Public Works Committee.—Appointment of Members: Meetings	2995		Public Accounts Committee.—Appointment of Members	3053	
Papua Bill.—Second Reading	2995		Papua Bill	3053	
Census and Statistics Bill.—Second Reading	2996		Census and Statistics Bill	3054	
Public Service Bill.—Second Reading	2996		Arbitration (Public Service) Bill.—Second Reading	3054	
			Adjournment.—Australian Imperial Force: Band Instruments.—War Gratuity Bonds: Insurance Agents' Commission: Purchase of Furniture—Private Members' Motions	3074	

[Contents continued on Page 4 of Cover.]

Exchange Duplicate, L. C.

PRICE, including Postage 2s. 6d. per annum, or 2d. per number. Subscriptions should be sent to the Government Printer, Melbourne.

 Dup.
U. of C.
Oh.

EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.

FIRST SESSION.

Governor-General.

His Excellency the Right Honorable Sir RONALD CRAUFURD MUNRO FERGUSON, a Member of His Majesty's Most Honorable Privy Council, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Commonwealth of Australia.

Australian National Government.

(From 10th January, 1918.)

Prime Minister and Attorney-General	..	The Right Honorable William Morris Hughes, P.C., K.C.
Minister for the Navy	..	The Right Honorable Sir Joseph Cook, P.C., G.C.M.G.
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable W. H. Laird Smith (28th July, 1920).
Treasurer	..	The Right Honorable Lord Forrest, P.C., G.C.M.G.
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
		The Right Honorable William Alexander Watt, P.C. (27th March, 1918).†††
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
		The Right Honorable Sir Joseph Cook, P.C., G.C.M.G. (28th July, 1920).
Minister for Defence	..	The Honorable George Foster Pearce.
Minister for Repatriation	..	The Honorable Edward Davis Millen.
Minister for Works and Railways	..	The Right Honorable William Alexander Watt, P.C.
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
		The Honorable Littleton Ernest Groom (27th March, 1918).
Minister for Home and Territories	..	The Honorable Patrick McMahon Glynn, K.C. †††
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
		The Honorable Alexander Poynton (4th February, 1920).
Minister for Trade and Customs	..	The Honorable Jens August Jensen.†
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
		The Right Honorable William Alexander Watt, P.C. (13th December, 1918).
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
		The Honorable Walter Massy Greene (17th January, 1919).
Postmaster-General	..	The Honorable William Webster. †††
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
		The Honorable George Henry Wise (4th February, 1920).
Vice-President of the Executive Council	..	The Honorable Littleton Ernest Groom.
		<i>Succeeded by</i>
		The Honorable Edward John Russell (27th March, 1918).
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable Edward John Russell.
		Appointed Vice-President of the Executive Council, 27th March, 1918.
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable Alexander Poynton.
		Appointed Minister for Home and Territories, 4th February, 1920.
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable George Henry Wise.
		Appointed Postmaster-General, 4th February, 1920.
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable Walter Massy Greene.
		Appointed Minister for Trade and Customs, 17th January, 1919.*
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable Richard Beaumont Orchard**
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable Sir Granville de Lanne Ryrie, K.C.M.G., C.B., V.D. ††
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable William Henry Laird Smith.††
		Appointed Minister for the Navy, 28th July, 1920.
Honorary Minister	..	The Honorable Arthur Stanislaus Rodgers.***

* Appointed 26th March, 1918. —† Removed from office, 13th December, 1918. —** Resigned office, 31st January, 1919. —†† Appointed 4th February, 1920. —††† Resigned 3rd February, 1920. —†††† Resignation from office gazetted, 15th June, 1920. —*** Appointed 28th July, 1920.

Senators.

(From 1st July, 1920.)

President—Senator the Honorable Thomas Givens.

Chairman of Committees—Senator Thomas Jerome Kingston Bakhap.

Adamson, Hon. John, C.B.E. (Q.)	Guthrie, James Francis (V.)
Bakhap, Thomas Jerome Kingston (T.)	Guthrie, Robert Storrie (S.A.)
Benny, Benjamin (S.A.)	Henderson, George (W.A.)
Bolton, William Kinsey (V.)	Keating, Hon. John Henry (T.)
³ Buzacott, Richard (W.A.)	Lynch, Hon. Patrick Joseph (W.A.)
Cox, Charles Frederick, C.B., C.M.G. (N.S.W.)	Millen, Hon. Edward Davis (N.S.W.)
Crawford, Thomas William (Q.)	Millen, John Dunlop (T.)
De Largie, Hon. Hugh (W.A.)	¹ Newland, John (S.A.)
Drake-Brockman, Edmund Alfred (W.A.)	Payne, Hon. Herbert James Mockford (T.)
Duncan, Walter Leslie (N.S.W.)	² Pearce, Hon. George Foster (W.A.)
Earle, Hon. John (T.)	¹ Plain, William (V.)
Elliott, Harold Edward, C.B., C.M.G. (V.)	Pratten, Herbert Edward (N.S.W.)
Fairbairn, George (V.)	Reid, Matthew (Q.)
Foll, Hattil Spencer (Q.)	¹ Rowell, James, C.B. (S.A.)
² Foster, George Matthew (T.)	Russell, Hon. Edward John (V.)
Gardiner, Hon. Albert (N.S.W.)	Senior, William (S.A.)
Givens, Hon. Thomas (Q.)	Thomas, Hon. Josiah (N.S.W.)
Glasgow, Sir Thomas William, K.C.B., C.M.G. (Q.)	Wilson, Reginald Victor (S.A.)

1. Appointed Temporary Chairman of Committees, 21st July, 1920. 2. Sworn 21st July, 1920.
3. Appointed Temporary Chairman of Committees, 26th February, 1920.

House of Representatives.

Friday, 23 July, 1920.

The CLERK reported the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the chair at 11.1 a.m. and read prayers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. RYAN.—Yesterday, when the Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook) was speaking, he suggested by the words that he used that I had something to do with the getting together of a very large gathering, amounting to many thousands of persons, that assembled within the precincts of this House on Thursday evening.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I made no such suggestion at any time.

Mr. RYAN.—Then I misunderstood the right honorable gentleman. He suggested that the gathering synchronized with my advent to the House, although a War Precautions regulation had been in existence for quite a long time prohibiting such gatherings. I assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, honorable members, and the people at large, that I had nothing whatever to do with the getting together of that assembly, and knew nothing of it. I addressed some words to it, but only in response to the request of the gathering, and with a view to urging it to keep within the law, and to use that self-restraint—those were my very words—which I thought necessary to save the right honorable gentleman and some of those associated with him from the consequences of the public indignation aroused by their arbitrary exercise of the powers conferred by the War Precautions Act.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—In reply to what the honorable member has said, and also by way of personal explanation, I wish to say that the Government are very much obliged to him for his offer of help. We should, however, appreciate infinitely more his action in refraining from addressing unlawful gatherings.

Mr. BRENNAN.—I desire to make a personal explanation.

Mr. LISTER.—How long is this farce to continue?

5U

Mr. BRENNAN.—I ask that that objectionable expression be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Will the honorable member withdraw the expression complained of?

Mr. LISTER.—I made the interjection, and I repeat it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If the honorable member applied the words to any other honorable member, he must withdraw them.

Mr. BRENNAN.—If he applied them to the proceedings of Parliament they must be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I ask the honorable member to obey the rules of the House.

Mr. LISTER.—In deference to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I withdraw what I said.

Mr. BRENNAN.—It is reported in the press that yesterday, just before the honorable member for Maribyrnong (Mr. Fenton) invited the Serjeant-at-Arms to a cup of tea, the Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook) referred to me as an "insulting brute." It is almost incredible to me that the right honorable gentleman could have used such words, and it is unthinkable that they should have been applied, as is suggested in the press, to one whose manners and deportment have been modelled always on those of the late Lord Chesterfield. It is true that I heard the right honorable gentleman use the words "insulting brute," but I regarded them as in the nature of a soliloquy rather than of an epithet, and did not take objection to them, because I was under the impression that he was applying them to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or to himself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I hardly think that that is a personal explanation. The honorable member takes exception to an expression used by the Minister for the Navy, which he considers derogatory; but at the time the interjections across the chamber were causing such a babel that it was impossible for me to hear what was being said. The occurrence shows the need for obeying the rules of the House by keeping silence.

THE TREASURERSHIP.

Mr. TUDOR.—In the absence of the Prime Minister, I ask the Leader of the House what is the reason for the undue delay in filling the position of Treasurer.

It is over a month since the right honorable member for Balaclava (Mr. Watt) resigned his portfolio, and statements have been made as to the extraordinary position of our finances. I wish to know when the office is likely to be filled.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I candidly confess that I cannot give the honorable member an answer that he would like.

Mr. TUDOR.—Tell us what you would like, and we shall then know whether it is what we would like.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—For one thing, I would not like a Treasurer from the Labour party, with all due respect for the capacity of the honorable member for East Sydney (Mr. West).

HIGH COMMISSIONERSHIP.

Mr. RYAN.—In the absence of the Prime Minister, I ask the Leader of the House whether, in view of the rumoured probability of his being appointed High Commissioner for Australia in London, the Government will give honorable members an opportunity to discuss the suitability of the proposed appointee before any appointment is made?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I know nothing whatever of any rumour as to any appointment to the High Commissionership. I have said that before, though the honorable member keeps repeating a contrary statement. At this moment I know nothing whatever of any appointment to the High Commissionership. The position is not vacant, and will not become so for some time.

Mr. TUDOR.—Senator Pearce and the late Sir Edmund Barton made similar statements.

PRICE OF BUTTER.

Mr. CORSER.—Is it the intention of the Government to continue price fixing in relation to butter after the termination of the current contract with the Imperial Government, which expires on the 31st instant?

Mr. GREENE.—I have already given notice of my intention to move for leave to bring in a Bill to enable the contract which has been entered into between the producers of butter here and the British Government to be carried into effect; but the Crown Law officers advise me that, beyond doing that, it is not possible for

the Government to fix the price of butter after the termination, on the 31st July, of the existing contract.

INTERNATIONAL POSTAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Is it proposed that Australia shall be represented at the forthcoming International Postal Conference?

Mr. WISE.—The Secretary to the Postmaster-General's Department has been appointed to represent Australia at the Conference.

TELEPHONE MATERIAL.

Mr. RILEY.—Can the Postmaster-General tell us when supplies of telephone instruments and material may be expected? There is a dearth of telephones now, and the public are worrying members to get connexions made.

Mr. WISE.—I shall make inquiries, and ascertain when the material is to be expected.

WAR TROPHIES.

Mr. RODGERS.—I understand that war trophies are now being distributed only to centres having a population of not less than 300 persons, and I ask the Minister for Home and Territories whether a certain number cannot be set aside for distribution in the great back country which sent such a lot of fine young men to the Front?

Mr. POYNTON.—The honorable member is aware that a Committee consisting of State and Federal members of Parliament has been appointed to deal with this matter, and has arrived at a decision in connexion with the distribution of war trophies. However, I shall be pleased to put his suggestion before the Committee, that they may consider whether there is any necessity for an alteration of their proposals to secure a better distribution in country districts. If the honorable member will set out in a letter just what he desires should be done, I will submit it to the Committee at an early date.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I ask the Minister for Home and Territories whether it is possible to arrange for the distribution of war trophies on the basis of the population of shires and municipalities rather

than on the basis of the population of certain centres?

Mr. POYNTON.—Notice ought to be given of questions of this kind. I suggest to the honorable member that he should do what I have asked the honorable member for Wannon (Mr. Rodgers) to do—set out his views in a letter, which I will put before the Committee.

MERCANTILE MARINE.

WAR SERVICE.

Mr. BURCHELL asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Is the Government taking any steps to issue war medals to members of the mercantile marine of Australia; and, if so, at what time will they be issued, and what are the medals?

2. Are all grades in the mercantile marine, who have qualified by service in the war zone, to be duly recognised by the issue of these medals?

3. Are the returned sailors of the mercantile marine of Australia of all grades eligible for participation in the Government schemes of repatriation, including housing?

Mr. HUGHES.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1 and 2. In May, 1919, the Government decided to issue a mercantile marine war-zone badge to masters and seamen of the mercantile marine who had served on a vessel under Australian articles which had traded within the war zone for any period during the war, and 3,500 badges have already been issued.

The term "war zone" applies to routes followed by such vessels when proceeding to and from a port on the Atlantic side of North America and Africa and/or in the United Kingdom, the Continent of Europe, or on the Mediterranean coast of Africa, and commences or terminates in each case at (a) the eastern end of the Panama Canal; (b) the Cape of Good Hope; (c) Suez.

In the case of a deceased seaman who would have been entitled to a badge, it was decided that the badge should be awarded to his next of kin.

The distribution of these badges has been undertaken by the Superintendent, Mercantile Marine Office, Melbourne, and applications may be made to that officer direct, or through the superintendents of marine of the other States, from whom the necessary application forms may be obtained.

3. Members of the mercantile marine are not eligible under the Repatriation Act, but the Government have agreed to include within the provisions of the War Service Homes Act seamen and others who have been awarded the Australian mercantile marine war-zone badge or the British mercantile marine medal.

PAN-PACIFIC SCIENTIFIC CONGRESS.

REPRESENTATION OF COMMONWEALTH.

Dr. EARLE PAGE asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Whether any arrangements have been made for the adequate representation of the Commonwealth at the Pan-Pacific Scientific Congress, to meet at Honolulu in August of this year?

2. If so, what arrangements have been made?

Mr. HUGHES.—The matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

PRICE OF NEWS PRINTING PAPER.

Dr. EARLE PAGE asked the Minister for Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

Whether, in view of the hardship imposed on the provincial press through the present method of assessing the value of newsprint for Customs purposes, the Minister would fix the home consumption price of unglazed newsprint, flat or reel, at, say, £30 per ton till local consumers are able to purchase their requirements at fair trade values, or, alternatively, a fixed duty of not more than £3 per ton?

Mr. GREENE.—It is not practicable to grant the honorable member's request without an amendment of the Customs Act. This is not expedient, in view of the fact that it would accord preferential treatment to news printing paper as against other imported commodities.

WHEAT.

PAYMENT OF COMMONWEALTH GUARANTEE.

Mr. HAY asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

Whether it is the intention of the Government to pay the 5s. guaranteed to wheat-growers in the States of the Commonwealth on delivery at country railway stations which was paid in respect of last year's wheat delivered?

Mr. HUGHES.—The method of payment of the amount guaranteed in respect of next season has not yet been determined.

NORTH-SOUTH RAILWAY.

Mr. MAKIN asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

Whether the Government will intimate its intention in connexion with the early construction of a direct north-south railway connecting the Northern Territory and South Australia?

Mr. HUGHES.—The intentions of the Government will be announced in due course. I may add that I am to receive a deputation of Federal members from South Australia next week, and the matter can then be discussed.

NATURALIZATION OF FOREIGNERS.

Mr. STORY (for Mr. HIGGS) asked the Minister for Home and Territories, *upon notice*—

Will he state for public information—

1. What are the terms and conditions under which a foreigner may become naturalized in Australia, and the procedure to be adopted in making application for naturalization?

2. What foreigners may not become naturalized in Australia?

Mr. POYNTON.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows:—

1. The necessary conditions of the law as it stands at present are: (a) residence for two years; (b) good character; (c) knowledge of the English language.

The procedure is for the alien to apply, giving the information and certificates of character as required in the departmental forms and to advertise his intention to apply. The Department then makes inquiries, and if the result is satisfactory the Governor-General is advised to approve of the issue of a certificate. The applicant next renounces his former allegiance, and takes the oath of allegiance to the King, after which the certificate is prepared and issued.

2. Aboriginal natives of Asia, Africa, or the Pacific Islands, excepting New Zealand, are declared by law not to be eligible to apply. At present it is not the practice to naturalize former enemy aliens or Russians unless for exceptional reasons approved by the Minister. I may add, for the honorable member's information, that a new law on the subject is in course of preparation, and a Bill to give effect throughout the Empire to Australian certificates will be introduced shortly.

CONGESTION OF AUSTRALIAN PRODUCTS IN LONDON.

Mr. MAKIN asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Whether the Government will make inquiries concerning the reported congestion at the London docks of foodstuffs exported from Australia?

2. If such congestion is found to exist, will the Government so regulate exports that Australian home requirements will be fully supplied?

Mr. HUGHES.—Inquiries will be made. I will send a cable and ascertain the position.

DAIRY PRODUCE POOL.

Mr. FRANCIS asked the Minister for Trade and Customs, *upon notice*—

Whether it is the intention of the Government to continue the Commonwealth Dairy Produce Pool after the 31st August, 1920?

Mr. GREENE.—The reply is "No," except with regard to transactions not yet completed, and, to a limited extent, in connexion with the recent sale of butter to the Imperial Government. In accordance with an arrangement made with the Imperial Government, the present contract will expire on the 31st July.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MAHONY (Dalley) [11.24].—I move—

That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the consideration of Notice of Motion No. 1 in the name of Mr. Groom.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I understand that the business of the day has been called on, and therefore the honorable member's motion is too late.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—The particular Order of the Day appearing first on the paper has not been called on, and therefore the motion of the honorable member for Dalley is in order.

Mr. MAHONY.—My reason for submitting the motion must at once be apparent to any thoughtful person. Those who have any foresight at all can see looming in the immediate future the danger of great industrial turmoil in Australia. The business to which this Parliament should devote its attention is the consideration of the steps necessary to prevent industrial disputes raging from one end of this country to the other. The Government propose now to go on with the consideration of a Bill for the establishment of an Institute of Science and Industry, but that is not a matter of pressing importance, and its consideration may be delayed for a week or two weeks. The amendment of the industrial conciliation and arbitration laws of this country is a matter that cannot wait, because a day's delay in dealing with such a matter may be vital to the maintenance of industrial peace in Australia.

Mr. RYAN.—Ministers have said that the settlement of these matters is urgent.

Mr. MAHONY.—Nothing could be more urgent, and that is why I have submitted my motion.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES) put—

That the question be now put.

The House divided.

Ayes	32
Noes	17

Majority	15
----------	----	----	----

AYES.

Atkinson, L.	Hay, A.
Bamford, F. W.	Hill, W. C.
Bayley, J. G.	Hughes, W. M.
Best, Sir Robert	Jowett, E.
Blundell, R. P.	Lister, J. H.
Cameron, D. C.	Mackay, G. H.
Chapman, Austin	Marks, W. M.
Cook, Sir Joseph	Page, Dr. Earle
Cook, Robert	Poynton, A.
Corser, E. B. C.	Prowse, J. H.
Foster, Richard	Rodgers, A. S.
Fowler, J. M.	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Francis, F. H.	Wise, G. H.
Gibson, W. G.	
Greene, W. M.	
Gregory, H.	
Groom, L. E.	

Tellers:

Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

NOES.

Blakeley, A.	McDonald, C.
Brennan, F.	Riley, E.
Cunningham, L. L.	Ryan, T. J.
Gabb, J. M.	Tudor, F. G.
Lavelle, T. J.	Watkins, D.
Lazzarini, H. P.	West, J. E.
Mahony, W. G.	
Makin, N. J. O.	
Maloney, Dr.	

Tellers:

Charlton, M.
Moloney, Parker

PAIRS.

Watt, W. A.	Anstey, F.
Bowden, E. K.	Catts, J. H.
Fleming, W. M.	Mathews, J.
Smith, Laird	Mahon, H.
Maxwell, G. A.	Page, James
Livingston, J.	Considine, M. P.
Lamond, Hector	McGrath, D. C.
Bell, G. J.	Fenton, J. E.
Jackson, D. S.	Nicholls, S. R.

In division:

Mr. RYAN.—I rise to a point of order. Is the Prime Minister in order in moving the closure before the question has been submitted to the House from the Chair?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—I will reply to the honorable member's point of order when the division on the motion has been taken.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the motion be agreed to—put. The House divided.

Ayes	17
Noes	32

Majority	15
----------	----	----	----

AYES.

Brennan, F.	Moloney, Parker
Charlton, M.	Riley, E.
Cunningham, L. L.	Ryan, T. J.
Gabb, J. M.	Tudor, F. G.
Lavelle, T. J.	Watkins, D.
Lazzarini, H. P.	West, J. E.
Makin, N. J. O.	
Maloney, Dr.	
McDonald, C.	

Tellers:

Blakeley, A.
Mahony, W. G.

NOES.

Atkinson, L.	Hay, A.
Bamford, F. W.	Hill, W. C.
Bayley, J. G.	Hughes, W. M.
Best, Sir Robert	Jowett, E.
Blundell, R. P.	Lister, J. H.
Cameron, D. C.	Mackay, G. H.
Chapman, Austin	Marks, W. M.
Cook, Sir Joseph	Page, Dr. Earle
Cook, Robert	Poynton, A.
Corser, E. B. C.	Prowse, J. H.
Foster, Richard	Rodgers, A. S.
Fowler, J. M.	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Francis, F. H.	Wise, G. H.
Gibson, W. G.	
Greene, W. M.	
Gregory, H.	
Groom, L. E.	

Tellers:

Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

PAIRS.

Anstey, F.	Watt, W. A.
Catts, J. H.	Bowden, E. K.
Mathews, J.	Fleming, W. M.
Mahon, H.	Smith, Laird
Page, James	Maxwell, G. A.
Considine, M. P.	Livingston, J.
McGrath, D. C.	Lamond, Hector
Fenton, J. E.	Bell, G. J.
Nicholls, S. R.	Jackson, D. S.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—In reference to the point of order raised by the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan), the standing order relating to the closure reads:—

(a) After any question has been proposed, either in the House or in any Committee of the Whole, a motion may be made by any member, rising in his place, and without notice, and whether any other member is addressing the Chair or not, "That the question be now put," and the motion shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate.

Therefore, I rule that the motion of the Prime Minister was in order.

Mr. RYAN.—The standing order uses the words "after any question has been proposed." That means proposed from the Chair. I submit that there is no question before the House until it has been stated by Mr. Speaker. The mere fact that some honorable member rises and intimates that he intends to move a motion does not place such motion before

the House; it must be submitted to the House from the Chair. Therefore, no motion to closure debate can be entertained, until the question has been submitted from the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—My interpretation of the rule differs from that of the honorable member, and I repeat my ruling that the Prime Minister was within his rights, and that his motion to closure the debate was in order.

Mr. RYAN.—I give notice of my intention to move that your ruling be disagreed with.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—On a point of order, I submit that there is a standing order which enables Mr. Speaker, in his discretion, to refuse to accept frivolous points of order, or motions of dissent put forward by honorable members for the purpose of obstructing business. That that is the purpose of honorable members opposite is patent to everybody.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order! I have not yet received from the honorable member for West Sydney his written notice of dissent.

Mr. RYAN.—In order that there may be no misapprehension, such as arose in connexion with the motion of dissent which was dealt with on Wednesday, I am willing to include in my written notice of motion, your own wording of your ruling, sir.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member is taking charge of the House, and that must be stopped some way or other.

Mr. RYAN.—I give notice that I shall move—

That Mr. Speaker's ruling, that the motion "That the question be now put" can be received before the question itself has been proposed to the House by Mr. Speaker, be disagreed to.

Mr. WISE.—That is not the Speaker's ruling. The Speaker does not "propose" the motion at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I did not "propose" the matter to the House. If the honorable member means that I put the question to the House, he had better express it so for the sake of accuracy.

Mr. RYAN.—My point is that you should have proposed the question to the House.

Mr. WISE.—Mr. Speaker puts or states the question; he does not propose it.

Mr. RYAN.—"Propose" and "state" are synonymous terms. I am quite willing to add the words "or stated," so as to make it read "before the question itself has been proposed or stated to the House by Mr. Speaker."

Notice of motion amended accordingly.

INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from 22nd July (*vide* page 2964), on motion by Mr. GREENE—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. EARLE PAGE (Cowper) [11.48].—I drew attention last night to the various methods that had been called into operation in the United States of America and Canada—the two great Federations which are similar to this country in their extent, in the time of their development, and in their problems—in order to co-ordinate Federal and State activities. I should like to outline the methods adopted in those countries to insure that there should be no duplication, overlapping, or friction between the State and Federal Governments, either in administration or in the work itself. When the original Commission of Conservation was appointed in Canada, these were the lines that were followed:—

In determining the lines upon which action should be taken, it was recognised that there was grave danger that the authorities of the Provinces might look with jealousy upon any Commission created by Federal legislation, and the provisions of the Act were expressly framed in such a way as to preclude the possibility of any ground for such a feeling, the representation being, in fact, such as to secure, as far as possible, the most effective representation of the views of each Province. The Commission is, in fact, probably the most truly national in its composition of any body that has ever been constituted in Canada.

I commend to our Government the lines adopted by the Canadian governmental activities, as shown in the first annual report of the Commission:—

Where the scope is almost infinite, the effort should be to choose that which is immediately practical and useful. And, first of all, it appears clear to us that provision should be made for making a comprehensive and accurate inventory of our natural resources, so

far as our available information extends. The beginning of all proper investigations is the ascertainment of facts, and there is no country that I know of where it is more urgently necessary in the public interest that the natural resources should be tabulated and inventoried than it is in Canada. When the Commission was appointed by the Canadian Government to go to Washington last winter, we set on foot a preliminary movement to tabulate information. The results of that work are now among our records. It is, we may say, of the most fragmentary description.

That was what the Canadian Government found regarding State activities, such as we have had, which had been in operation for many years—

It was surprising to find how difficult it was to get anything like accurate information. Statistical information of the class which our census officers prepare is abundant and accurate, but it does not assume to deal with the question of natural resources. At the present moment there are but few publications of any Government in Canada which give accurate and comprehensive information upon these subjects.

The utility of such an inventory hardly needs discussion. Both for the purposes of development and of conservation it is the first essential to have an accurate and complete statement of the facts, readily available, accessible to all, and couched in language that the average reader can understand.

Those were the lines on which the Canadian Government carried out this project, and now, ten years afterwards, they have, I suppose, one of the most complete, far-reaching, and comprehensive tabulations of the natural resources of their territory to be found in the world. The lines on which they have developed are worth imitating in Australia to-day.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—How are their Provinces represented?

Dr. EARLE PAGE.—They have representation practically on the lines of the advisory councils, which I gather were provided for in the previous measure proposed to this Parliament. I understand from this morning's press that the Government intend to re-introduce provision for those advisory councils in this Bill.

Mr. JOWETT.—Then the Provinces have representation and some share of power?

Dr. EARLE PAGE.—Both in Canada and the United States of America the Federal Government, in many instances, subsidizes the State or provincial activi-

ties. In the case of agriculture, for instance, it does not overlap. It appoints its men in certain departments of work, but it does not "butt" into those which the State or Province already fills. In those cases, it simply subsidizes and increases the possibilities for good of the officers already in existence. It does not interfere with their control in any degree.

Mr. JOWETT.—From what you have said, evidently the Provinces have some right of representation and some share of power.

Dr. EARLE PAGE.—There has never been any conflict there, because there has been a continual desire to work in co-operation. The governmental activities are linked up properly, thus resulting in co-ordination and not in duplication. The Federal activities simply fit into whatever vacant places there are in the existing mechanism. For instance, the Commission went into the question of mineral development. It found that practically the whole of the mining development of Canada had taken place in the central and inhabited territories, but that wherever prospecting had been done in uninhabited parts, indications had been found of the presence of valuable minerals, and in some cases great wealth had been uncovered. The Commission was satisfied, and has proved in the last ten years, that continual prospecting and mapping out of the areas has been of great value in indicating the most likely places to search for valuable deposits. Large bodies of ore were at the same time found to be useless because they could be worked only by certain special processes. The Government, in their physical laboratories, on a proper and comprehensive scale, investigated, for example, the question of the electric smelting of certain ores. They were able to handle successfully ores containing sulphur which had previously been absolutely useless, and to produce from certain of such iron ores some of the finest steel in the world. As the honorable member for New England (Mr. Hay) says, something similar has taken place in Australia. Through the application of a process discovered at the Technological Museum, at Sydney, the whole system of the extraction of zinc, lead, and copper has been absolutely revolutionized in the last ten or fifteen years. That alone is an instance of the enormous importance of

creating such an institute as is now proposed, and of applying science more extensively than is done at present. It was found in Canada, also, that many industries, such as zinc production, were entirely at the mercy of foreign smelters and refiners, and that enormous waste was taking place because in the ore sent abroad there were certain residues for which practically no value was given. The Canadian authorities set to work on a practical and scientific scale to investigate processes which would enable those ores to be treated, and the resulting wealth retained, in their own country. That is one direction in which great development has taken place since the efforts of the various Provinces were co-ordinated in Canada.

But in public health, especially, there has been the biggest advance, by reason of the establishment of a body on the lines that we now propose to follow. It is recognised everywhere nowadays that the physical strength of a people is the source from which all efforts derive their value. The extreme and scrupulous regard for the lives and health of the population may be taken as the best criterion of real civilization and refinement to which a country has attained. Any one who thinks at all can appreciate the fact that the care of public health must essentially be a Federal, and not a State, matter. I venture to say that if, during the last influenza epidemic, the proposals of the Federal Quarantine authorities had been carried out in their entirety, we might have been saved, to a very large extent, the invasion of the whole of our country districts by influenza, and possibly we might have been saved the invasion of several of the States. Then there is the question of water supply, the pollution of streams, and so on. Many streams are Inter-State in their catchment, but at present cannot be put under uniform control, simply by reason of the fact that the Federal authority is not given sufficient power. There has been established in Melbourne already, in connexion with the Institute, a very valuable laboratory, in which sera for curative and prophylactic purposes have been manufactured, for use, not only in cases of human sickness—such as diphtheria or tuberculosis—but also in certain animal diseases. The value of that undertaking was never

Dr. Earle Page.

thoroughly appreciated until the war had practically isolated us from other countries. If that provision had not been in existence at that time, we might have easily had a much bigger loss of human life in this country, simply because we were dependent entirely upon outside sources. We can scarcely expect, in a continent of the size of Australia, sparsely populated as it is, private people to undertake the preparation of these vaccines and sera on a commercial scale. In any case, if they are undertaken by private enterprise, there is always the possibility that we shall be unable to control them sufficiently in the interests of public health. The greatest value which can be gained by the establishment of the Institute will be found, as it has proved in Canada, in the matter of the proper tabulation and indexing of the water resources of the Continent. Australia is continually referred to as being drought-ridden. But in the eastern half of Australia, from the Gulf of Carpentaria right down to Adelaide, and taking a distance inland of from 300 to 400 miles from the eastern seaboard, the area compares very favorably in the matter of rainfall with any other similar average area of the continents of the world. Indeed, taking a survey of the continents generally, it will be found that the waste country within Australia is in no sense disproportionate. The greatest industrial development in recent years has come about by the utilization of water for the generation of electric power. From the River Barron, in the north, to the Murray in the south, and along the whole of the eastern coast as well as on the western slopes of the Dividing Range, there are afforded innumerable opportunities for practical scientific investigation, development, and exploitation of water power. This is a matter which should be very thoroughly investigated. The whole subject of the utilization of our streams should be placed on such a basis as to permit exploitation either by the Government or from outside sources. Linked up with this subject of water resources there is the great question of irrigation and conservation. In this respect a strange criticism of Australia's position is to be found in the final report of the Dominions Royal Commission,

which was issued in 1917 after the Commission had traversed and taken evidence all over the Empire. In this publication, following upon references to the possibilities in Canada, New Zealand and elsewhere, it will be found that there are only about five lines devoted to Australia under the heading of water power. These cover the whole subject of our country's possibilities of development by simply remarking, in effect, that no evidence was forthcoming. This referred to the year 1915, and no evidence could be placed before the Commission simply because there had been no national inventory taken of our resources. In Victoria, however, I understand that some attempt has been made to obtain information along these lines.

MR. RICHARD FOSTER.—And a little has been done also in South Australia.

DR. EARLE PAGE.—In New South Wales, I believe, some small effort has been made during the past five years; but not more than £10,000, at the outside, has been involved in research upon so important a national feature. The British Prime Minister (Mr. Lloyd George) referred with apprehension the other day, in a public speech, to the fact that the industrial supremacy of England was being seriously threatened by the fact that coal as the source of industrial power was being superseded in various countries by the application of water power. He added that by such means Sweden was becoming a serious menace to Britain's industrial leadership.

The proposed Institute can prove of enormous value, also in relation to agriculture, which industry depends so very closely upon the maintenance of the fertility of the soil. Prosperity cannot endure unless means are taken to insure close and anxious watchfulness upon our soil. We know full well that some of the great lands of the Old World, which once flourished and carried populations of millions, have become deserts, their inhabitants numbering but a few hundreds of thousands. Egypt was once the granary of the world, but its soil became impoverished; and only now, by the conservation of water and the control of that water, has some of its agricultural glory been revived. A country which depends almost entirely upon agriculture and is closely populated can be-

gin to grow hopelessly impoverished inside of 200 years unless extreme care is taken to conserve its soil. There must be a proper rotation of crops, for example, and selection of seed. It is easier to conserve the fertility of the soil than to restore it. The proposed Institute should co-ordinate all the effort at present being undertaken throughout Australia with respect to agriculture. It should concentrate all the activity and research which have proceeded in dealing with the question of live-stock. It should take regard of such experiments, for instance, as have been made by the honorable member for New England (Mr. Hay) in the direction of herd-testing. The provision of manures and public instruction as to rotation of crops should be matters transcending our State borders. In the United States of America there are not only the State Departments of Agriculture, which do their work very well. For example, some of the smaller States—less in area than Victoria—have from ten to twenty agricultural colleges. But, in addition, the Federal Government have one huge Department which deals exclusively with the improvement of agriculture and with agricultural conditions generally. This Department does not act in any way upon a merely State basis. It has three main head-quarters, namely, at Washington, Chicago, and San Francisco; and there are thirty or more local centres distributed throughout the States. Not only does this Department provide instruction and see to such matters as securing weather reports, but it endeavours both to increase production and to enhance the returns of the primary producer by securing for him favorable market conditions. It has established an office of markets and rural organization which possesses the largest and best trained staff of experts to be found concentrated upon this one subject in any part of the world. It investigates all the larger and more difficult problems confronting the farmer to-day. In the matter of marketing the people of Australia experienced during the war strong evidence of the fact that national activity can insure better opportunities and prices than along the lines either of State organization or private enterprise. As well as interesting itself in that phase,

the organization in America has inaugurated a system of providing market reports to cover the whole of the States. Thus, a farmer knows before he ships his produce, where he is likely to secure the best return; and he can gain some idea of his profits then, instead of having to wait for a return from his commission agent. A Grain Standards Act has been passed in the United States of America, with the idea of insuring uniform grading, so as to enable the farmer to obtain a far better price for his produce and at the same time diminish the shipment of inferior grain. Thus the standard of the whole of the products of the country is scientifically and commercially increased. A proposition has been put forward for the establishment of bonded warehouses also, which will handle the farmers' produce in a co-operative fashion, and make him to a large extent independent of the market. He will be able to bring his produce to these warehouses and receive scrip, which can be negotiated to enable him to carry on. Thus, a practical effort is made to regulate the flush of a heavy season. Farmers in Australia know only too well that a good season is often less profitable than a comparatively poor one. In a good season the farmer is apt to get a low price for his abundant harvest, whereas in a poor year he can be fairly well assured of receiving an excellent return for whatever crop he reaps. In addition, in the United States of America, efforts have been made to inculcate sound ideas regarding the financing of farmers. It has been sought to emphasize the fact that the financing of the rural community should be placed on a slightly different scale and basis compared with other industries, for the main reason that the elements themselves are never absolutely stable.

In regard to another important source of activity great efforts have been made in the United States of America, namely, to improve and perfect the meat supply. By means of scientific research and experiment, wisely co-ordinated throughout the country, the authorities have been able very largely to eliminate the tick.

Although it is impossible for an Institute such as is proposed in the measure before the House to at once launch out on such a scale and undertake such a great scope of activities as I have

Dr. Earle Page.

indicated in speaking of the United States of America, yet its foundation will permit its gradual working up to some such force in the country; that is to say, if it is founded on lines such as have been suggested by scientists in Australia, and, indeed, by the whole of the practical experience of the world. It is to have only a small beginning, but it is to be hoped that it will steadily grow and act as a co-ordinating mechanism in relation to present institutions, not despising any activity of value being carried on at this moment. If it should develop as is hoped for it, the Institute must prove one of the most beneficent influences in Australian public life. There are not in Australia at present sufficient or adequate Departments to deal with our national problems. I will quote from the report of the Dominions Royal Commission, where it refers, in two or three specific instances, to what should be done in Australia. Dealing with the question of forestry, for instance, the report states—

There is no Federal Forestry Department in the Commonwealth, and though each State has instituted some conservation methods of its own, we are not satisfied that enough has been done. We are glad to observe, however, that there is a movement towards co-operation between the Forest Departments of the various States. Thus an Inter-State Conference of Forestry was held at Adelaide in May, 1916, and it is proposed to hold similar conferences annually in future. At the 1916 conference a scheme was approved to provide for the uniform training of a competent staff for the forestry services, and a resolution was passed advocating the exchange of officers between the different States.

Much, however, remains to be done. The total number of persons employed in the Forestry Departments of the various Australian States in 1914 was only 595, and the total expenditure of the year 1914-15 was only £158,000. Tasmania, which possesses some of the finest forest areas in the Commonwealth, spent only £1,200 on forestry in that year.

Then, in the matter of our fisheries, the report points out that a similar condition of affairs exists. It emphasizes that national co-ordination and co-operation would enable the Australian fishing industry to be placed on a far better basis, and so do away with the importation of almost £1,000,000 worth of fish every year. There are about 2,000 varieties of edible fish around the Australian coast, and yet each year we

import huge consignments. The Commission states—

The success of the action achieved during the war suggests that it is expedient that the various Governments of the Empire should take steps, as soon as conditions permit, to secure the development and utilization of their natural wealth on a well-considered scheme, directed towards a definite and recognised object. In our opinion, it is vital that the Empire should, so far as possible, be placed in a position which would enable it to resist any pressure which a foreign power, or group of powers, could exercise in time of peace or during war, in virtue of a control of raw materials and commodities essential for the safety and well-being of the Empire, and it is towards the attainment of this object that co-ordinated effort should be directed.

The result of a full survey should divide the necessary materials of trade and commerce into three main categories:—

- (1) The materials of which the world's requirements are mainly or wholly produced within the Empire.
- (2) Materials of which the Empire's requirements are approximately equalled by Empire production.
- (3) Materials of which the world's requirements, and with them those of the Empire, are now mainly produced and controlled outside the Empire.

In the case of minerals, a properly co-ordinated mineral survey of the Empire appears to us to be an urgent necessity. We recognise the value of the work hitherto performed by the Imperial Institute in collecting and disseminating the results of mineral and geological surveys in various parts of the Empire, and in some cases of actively directing them. We have also seen the joint recommendations recently made by the Iron and Steel Institute, the Institute of Metals, the Institute of Mining Engineers, and the Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, for the systematic collection and co-ordination of information bearing on the use of minerals and their production, and the investigation of all questions and problems relating to the utilization of the mineral and metallurgy resources of the Empire. Without indorsing their suggestion for the formation of a single Imperial Department of Minerals and Metals—a proposal which appears to us to offer constitutional and administrative difficulties at present—we are in sympathy with the general tenor of the proposals, and consider it urgent that systematic work in the direction indicated should be undertaken by the proposed Imperial Development Board, working in conjunction and co-operation with the existing scientific and research Departments and Institutions of the various Governments of the Empire.

Whenever this problem is dealt with, the Commission insists that in every Dominion there should be an institution charged with the tabulation and co-ordination of local resources, so that they may

be readily accessible, not only to the community, but to the whole of the British Empire.

Mr. BLAKELEY (Darling) [12.19].—

The Bill will, I hope, provide the nucleus of a system of scientific education in Australia which will supply a long-felt want. The financial position of the Commonwealth is such as to cause considerable uneasiness, and, therefore, it is very essential that we take some steps to organize our industries and exploit the wealth of this country, so that we may be in a position to meet our financial obligations. In 1914, the national debt—Federal and State—was £336,781,121; and in 1920, it had grown to £746,357,655, an increase in seven years of £409,000,000, not including about £40,000,000 owing to Great Britain in connexion with war services. The national debt of 1914 represented £68 8s. 4d. per head of population; and this year was £141—an increase in six years of over £73 per head. In 1914, the interest on this debt, per head of population, was £2 9s. 10d. per annum; and to-day it is £6. This is indeed a staggering liability for 5,000,000 people to bear. Figures relating to our imports and exports are not encouraging, for I find that, in 1913-14, we imported goods to the value of £79,749,683, and, in 1918-19, to the amount of £102,115,122. From a productive point of view, we occupy an almost unparalleled position; and, if we adopt adequate means to develop our natural resources, our progress should be entirely satisfactory. Unfortunately, we are neglecting our opportunities. For instance, we allow billions of gallons of water to run to waste, but the Murray waters scheme now in hand is a big undertaking, and, when completed, will prove of everlasting benefit to the Commonwealth. Generally speaking, we have done little to conserve our water supplies or to combat the many pests that attack our primary industries. I take it, therefore, that one of the first duties of this proposed Institute of Science and Industry will be to give careful attention to these particular problems.

Throughout the Commonwealth there is a general feeling that the hours of labour are too long and the wages paid insufficient for the requirements of the working classes, with the result that our Arbitration Courts are crowded and

industrial strife is with us every day. With the application of the principle of shorter hours for labour and higher wages there must be an insistent demand for the more efficient organization of all industrial enterprises, in order to meet the position by preventing the awful waste that is at present going on. This, I take it, will be the particular function of this proposed Institute. I may mention just one achievement, namely, the standardization of structural steel. If that alone stood to the credit of the Institute, it would more than justify its creation, for with the standardization of all structural steel a contractor in any part of the Commonwealth may now place an order for T-pieces, angle-irons, and collars with an assurance that everything will fit, whereas, prior to standardization, as many as three or four different standards were in general use, and consequently structural work was rendered more complicated.

Many other problems will claim the attention of this Institute, notably the prickly-pear pest and plant life of the Commonwealth generally, in connexion with which much valuable information has been already gained, and which, no doubt, will be the basis of further research work. I may mention the waste, representing hundreds of thousands of pounds annually, in our wool-washing and fellmongering establishments. Until recently, at all events, no steps have been taken to utilize these by-products, and the same may be said of by-products resulting from the manufacture of gas. It would, I think, pay the Government to employ a number of scientists to devote their sole attention to this problem; but those who control these private establishments should subsidize investigations into the by-products of coal gas. The Institute should consider the economic production of gas power and the more economical working of industries generally.

The Bill now before us is, I believe, a better proposition than was the first Bill, but it is not as clear, nor does it go so far, as I should like. It is reported that, owing to representations made to the Government, an amendment will be made to enable the formation of Advisory Councils throughout Australia.

Mr. Blakeley.

It has to be remembered that while men may be eminently fitted for research work, when it comes to work of a practical nature, apart from research, they are probably not so suitable as average business men. Great care will have to be exercised in the administration of this Institute. The Bill has not been received by the people of Australia with that approval which I think is necessary for the successful inauguration of the scheme. I should be sorry to see the Institute in any way hampered because of any public outcry owing to mistakes which have been made or may be made by it. Every possible avenue should be exploited in obtaining information to help in carrying the scheme to a successful issue. We in Australia have done practically nothing with regard to research. There are haphazard investigations by universities, technical colleges and similar institutions; and private companies and firms, such as the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, retain staffs of highly qualified scientific experts. The company I have mentioned has evolved a scheme of treatment which has reduced the expenditure on the production of sugar, and given many valuable by-products. The Broken Hill Proprietary Company has also a staff of experts whose special duty it is to watch the manufacture of steel. When I recently visited the works at Newcastle I found that there was not a steel rail produced which was not analyzed. Immediately an error or defect in the structure of the steel is detected a remedy is found before there has been any great waste. As specimen samples of the steel are chipped off automatically from the rails as they are produced, they are immediately tested by the analysts in order to see that they are quite up to standard. While these private firms and companies devote a certain amount of money to research, and the States, in a haphazard way, without co-ordination or co-operation, are many of them investigating the same problems, the lack of a governing or controlling head makes a good deal of the work, if not valueless, at least unproductive of much overlapping and waste. The sum total of the Australian expenditure in research work is not anything like what it should be in such a country as this; and I propose to

show what other countries are doing, confining myself to the agricultural phase of the question. The American States are not left to initiate or carry on the agricultural education of the people by means of scientific research, but are assisted by the Commonwealth Government on all occasions. The Federal Legislature of America, in 1864, alienated no less than 11,000,000 acres of land in order to endow agricultural colleges throughout the country. In that country there are practically unlimited funds available for the endowment of colleges, for scholarships, for scientific research, and so forth; and between 1862 and 1912 over 600 colleges and other institutions were founded to further the progress of agriculture, at a cost of something like £45,000,000. The Agricultural Department at Washington spends no less than £6,000,000 a year in subsidizing the agricultural colleges of the forty-eight States. As a matter of fact, in 1917 the expenditure was £10,000,000.

Mr. BURCHELL.—You must remember that the population of the United States of America is 110,000,000.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—I quite realize that fact; but if we, in proportion to our population had done as much as America has in the way of research and the exploitation of our natural resources, we should be in a much better position than we are to-day. In Italy, from 1907 to 1917, there were no fewer than 1,100 colleges, schools, and other institutions brought into being for the teaching of agriculture. In Switzerland, there are 1,600 agricultural colleges, subsidized to the extent of £250,000 per annum. In the small country of Belgium, prior to the war, something like £200,000 per annum was spent in this direction. In England, there are eight colleges supported by the County Councils by means of the rates, and subsidized by the Imperial Department of Agriculture. In Canada, owing probably to its close proximity to America, there is a much better system of education and research than in any other British Dominion. In Australia, many men have done good work, and, of these, I mention the late Mr. Farrar. The people of Australia generally have not yet realized what that gentleman did for Australia in increas-

ing the productive powers of the country. In New South Wales alone, by the breeding of his "Federation" wheat, he added thousands upon thousands of square miles to the wheat belt.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—It was my pride and privilege to secure the services of Mr. Farrar for the State Agricultural Department on a definite basis.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—Then the honorable gentleman secured a very good man. Working practically by himself, he evolved a type of wheat from which since that time other types have been obtained; and he laid down a basis of investigation which will, I hope, be followed by the Institute of Science and Industry. I urge upon the Government and those who will have the control of this scheme that, if this country is to have the benefit of the best brains, those brains will have to be paid for in competition with the older countries of the world. While some honorable members may object to derelict professors being paid large sums of money, if the Institute of Science and Industry is to succeed, we shall be compelled to immediately enter into competition with the whole of the countries of the world, with a view to obtaining the best possible brains. And it is worth our while to do so. Three years ago, I stressed the fact that the niggardly sums paid to the scientific brains of Australia are responsible for driving promising scientists from our midst to other countries where their services are more adequately remunerated. Every year men are attracted from the Commonwealth by the better pay which is offered to them elsewhere. We frequently find the names of men who graduated in the Sydney and Melbourne Universities, and particularly in our Schools of Mines, cropping up in Washington and London. They have practically been compelled to leave the country of their birth, and they will not return to it until we are willing to offer them an adequate recompense for their labours. Of course, if we want cheap scientists, we can get them. There are quite a number of scientific men who undertake investigations without fee or reward, and purely for love of their work. But there are others whose services are offered cheaply, and from whom nothing very much can be expected.

When I speak of scientists who, from their own private resources, have carried on investigational research, there occurs to my mind the name of McGarvie Smith, who has discovered an anthrax vaccine.

Mr. JOWETT.—He did not get much help from Government Departments.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—He received practically no assistance. Had the Institute of Science and Industry been established when he was carrying out his investigations, it would have afforded him all the necessary financial assistance. I believe that he was not a chemist or scientist as we understand the term, but that he possessed a natural aptitude for research work, being practically a self-taught man. Had he had the assistance of such an institution as it is proposed to create under this Bill, his researches might have proceeded much farther than they did. The formula which he handed to the Government of New South Wales has resulted in the annual saving of hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of stock in that State alone. There are other men here who have rendered valuable service to Australia, and in this connexion I may mention the name of Mr. Wilkinson, the Commonwealth Analyst. He has done very important work. The questions with which the Institute of Science and Industry has already dealt are many and varied. The destruction of prickly pear is one of them. This pest is assuming such gigantic proportions in Australia that we are compelled to take steps which will prevent it further infesting our good lands, and also to recover the land which has been already overrun by it. There are 23,000,000 acres infested with prickly pear.

Mr. BRENNAN.—That is in the whole of Australia?

Mr. BLAKELEY.—Yes, but principally in New South Wales and Queensland. In Australia we have only 17,000,000 acres of land under cultivation, but there are 23,000,000 acres infested with prickly pear. This pest is encroaching upon our lands to the extent of 1,000,000 acres annually. That is the extent to which it is growing. It is true that some time ago the Government offered a prize of £10,000 for a formula which would be effective in the destruction of prickly pear, or which would pro-

vide for some financial return whenever the pear was used for industrial purposes such as the production of industrial alcohol.

Mr. HIGGS.—The Queensland Government offered a reward of £10,000 to any person who could destroy the pear at a cost of £1 per acre.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—I believe that that is so. So far, however, no such formula has been forthcoming.

Mr. JOWETT.—But many scientific investigators throughout the world have been endeavouring to win the money.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—Yes. The Queensland Government, I repeat, offered a prize of £10,000 for the destruction of the pear, but that is altogether an inadequate sum. We have, in Australia, the prickly pear, nodules in beef, the blowfly, and other pests, and we can scarcely expect the scientists of the world to investigate means for their destruction unless we offer them an adequate remuneration for their services.

Dr. MALONEY.—The best men do not engage in research work for personal gain.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—But our scientists have to live just as do other people. We have had eminent scientists in this country. Recently we had in our midst a gentleman from England who came here to investigate means for the destruction of weevil in our wheat. He was acting on behalf of the British Government, and I am sorry that for the moment I forget his name.

Mr. JOWETT.—The honorable member is referring to Professor Lefroy.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—I thank the honorable member for reminding me of his name. In the very brief period that he was in Australia he constructed an apparatus for the treatment of wheat that was infested with weevil, and thereby succeeded in considerably reducing the loss which would otherwise have been sustained by the British Government. But for his work, practically the whole of the wheat of New South Wales would have been lost. Whilst Professor Lefroy was here he was approached by certain persons with a view to inducing him to inquire into means for combating the blowfly. As a matter of fact, he did a certain amount of work in that direction, and then returned to England. Everybody was under the impression that he

intended coming back to Australia. But, unfortunately, some petty squabble occurred, as the result of which he did not return. He has since declined to return unless he is adequately paid for his services.

Mr. JOWETT.—The real reason for his refusal to come back was that he was abused by a section of the press, which made very uncomplimentary remarks about him.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—If we wish to get the best talent to undertake scientific research work we must be prepared to pay a fair price for it. It would be worth millions of pounds to Australia if she could get rid of such pests as the prickly pear, the blowfly, and nodules in beef. In regard to the blowfly, I have repeatedly urged that it is not only the duty of the Commonwealth Government to offer a large reward for its destruction, but that the pastoralists themselves have a responsibility in this connexion, and that they should bear a fair share of the cost of any scientific investigation in that connexion. In co-operation with the State Governments, it would pay the Commonwealth to offer a prize of £1,000,000 for a formula the use of which would successfully combat the blowfly. In one little district with which I am familiar—that of Walgett, in New South Wales—a loss of not less than £250,000 was sustained in 1916 through the blowfly pest. Recently I observed that in Queensland a pastoralist, or the manager of a station there, has been conducting an investigation into the destruction of the blowfly by means of an arsenical jet. By his discovery he claims to have rendered sheep immune from this pest for two months.

Mr. JOWETT.—He forces the poison into the wool upon the skin of the sheep.

Mr. BLAKELEY.—That experiment might very well be taken as a basis for investigation by the proposed Institute. If we can guarantee that our flocks shall be perfectly immune from the blowfly pest for a period of two months, we shall save Australia many millions of pounds. Having been practically reared in the pastoral industry, nobody realizes more than I do the necessity for taking steps to prevent the terrible mortality which annually occurs in our flocks as the result of this pest. Then there is the tick pest. It ought not to be impossible for a successful investi-

gation into that matter to be carried on by the Institute of Science and Industry. I believe that prizes should be offered for the destruction of all the pests which afflict this country—prizes which will attract the best brains in the world. Whilst we should offer a prize of, say, £500,000 for the discovery of some means of destroying the blowfly, I think that any scientist who undertakes research work of that character, and who desires to carry on his investigations in Australia, should be paid for his services whilst he is here, irrespective of whether or not his efforts are successful.

"Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m."

Mr. BLAKELEY.—I was gratified to learn during the adjournment that the discovery of the formula which renders sheep immune from the blowfly for at least two months is the result of successful experiments carried out by the Institute of Science and Industry.

On previous occasions I have spoken of the mighty problem created by the awful ravages of venereal diseases. It was not until 1905 that the *Spirochoeta pallida*, the organism of syphilis, was discovered, and although eminent scientists have been endeavouring since the beginning of the fifteenth century to discover some formula for the treatment of venereal diseases, it was not until 1878 that the *gonococcus*, the organism of gonorrhoea, the lesser form of the disease, was discovered. Every year these diseases cause the death of 7,000 people in Australia, and each year the Commonwealth pays at least £150,000 in invalid pensions to persons suffering from them. Ten per cent. of the population are affected by the more serious complaint, and it is estimated that 40 per cent. suffer from the effects of the minor form. Dr. J. W. Barrett, who has carried out some very interesting tests in connexion with an eye clinic in Melbourne, has shown that out of 500 persons who attended the institution for mere errors of refraction, 14 per cent. showed signs of syphilis. There are 500 children admitted to Sydney hospitals every year suffering from a venereal complaint. It is a big question, and I hope that a special committee of the Institute of Science and Industry will be set to work in co-operation with the State institutions and Universities to endeavour to

discover some formula which will give to the people of this country a speedier relief than is now available. No matter how good the existing form of treatment may be, those suffering from the graver form of the two diseases cannot be cured under less than twelve months. I hope, also, that when a proper formula is established, laboratories will be set up for its manufacture and distribution. Venereal disease is responsible for the condition of 25 per cent. of the blind in the institutions of Australia, and 22 per cent. of the insane. Seeing that hundreds of thousands of pounds are paid every year in the shape of invalid pensions because of it, and that 7,000 Australians die from it annually, surely it is a Federal matter more than a State matter, and I hope that if a committee of the Institute is appointed to deal with it, special grants of money will be made available to it to enable research in this direction to proceed with greater expedition.

Australia is a young country with boundless resources which we mostly waste. No check is kept upon waste. We allow our water to rush away to the ocean; we allow our fodder to dry and be carried away by the winds; we allow our stock to be killed off by pests which are controllable by science; we have men carrying where machinery could do the work; we have men shovelling where machinery could do the work; we laboriously excavate, carry, and hew where machinery should be employed. The Institute of Science and Industry will have a vast deal of work to do to bring about the success which can be achieved by wise administration, and a wise selection of the men who will conduct the experiments, but in the end the good which will be caused to this country will be incalculable.

Sir ROBERT BEST (Kooyong) [2.24].—I am pleased that the Government have yielded to the general activity and interest exhibited throughout the world, since hostilities have ceased, towards the subject of scientific research; because upon increased efforts in that direction depends the volume of production of the world. It has been alleged against this Bill that it means the creation of a new spending Department and handing over to a new Institute

the control of large sums of money to be spent as the directors of the Institute see fit, with little or no supervision on the part of Parliament. But that is a wrong view for honorable members to take, because the directors of the Institute will not have the authority to spend one shilling without the consent of Parliament. On the various annual Estimates Parliament will be called upon to take the responsibility of deciding how much it is prepared to hand over to the Institute for the purpose of industrial and scientific research.

Mr. GABB.—After the money has been spent?

Sir ROBERT BEST.—No. The money must be appropriated by Parliament before it can be spent. Therefore if any complaint is to be lodged in that regard it must be lodged against Parliament itself, which alone must accept the responsibility.

In view of what is being done in other countries in this direction, the utmost encouragement should be extended to the Institute established here. Of course it must prove itself. The right men must be appointed to carry out the duties assigned to it. There can be no possibility of success unless we are fortunate in that regard. But as the Institute proves itself Parliament will be more and more liberal to it. I am hopeful that it will justify itself, and that there will be a generous response on the part of Parliament, in full recognition of the vast field of work in which the Institute will be obliged to operate.

As the honorable member for New England (Mr. Hay) has shown, there are two great branches of scientific research, agriculture and technology, as applied to industrial matters, which will serve to occupy the best energies and the ability of the ablest men who can be appointed to carry out the work of the Institute. The honorable member has dealt very fully with the agricultural side, and shown the great field for work in that direction. The few remarks I have to make this afternoon will be directed towards demonstrating what a vast field of work there is on the technological side. Technology has the widest possible scope, and should include the collection and distribution of technological

information for the advancement of the industries and arts of the Commonwealth, and the initiation of researches relative to technical manufacturing processes and the study of contemporary progress therein. We ought to have an Institute in the position to digest and fully consider the vast amount of literature coming to hand, dealing with the most recent activities in this direction. Part of the duties of the Institute should be the custody of standards of measurement, the verification of instruments and appliances of all kinds used as measures, and to co-operate with the States in the preparation of standards and specifications of quality of materials and merchandise generally. Co-operation with the States is vital.

I am glad to see certain provisions in the Bill which lay down in unmistakable terms the instruction of Parliament that there must be co-ordination and co-operation with State functions in industrial research work.

MR. GABB.—Are we not duplicating the work of the States?

SIR ROBERT BEST.—I am prepared to admit that valuable work has been performed by the State authorities, and I would be one of the first to criticise this measure if I thought that duplication was intended. There is, however, at present a wanton and wasteful system, the various States engaging in practically the same kind of work; but if these institutions can co-ordinate with the Federal body, and all the existing activities be linked up in an endeavour to apply science to industry in indicated directions, we shall be taking a very valuable step. The various Australian technical and scientific schools and the Universities now dealing with scientific questions should all be co-ordinated under the direction of the proposed Federal institution. I am glad that a number of honorable members have directed attention to this particular aspect of the question, and I am hopeful that the utmost effort will be made to establish a system of co-operation so that friction will be avoided and the work allowed to proceed in a harmonious manner for the good of the Commonwealth.

There is ample scope for technological work of a valuable character, and we are exceedingly fortunate in having in

the employment of the Commonwealth service our present principal analyst, Mr. Percy Wilkinson, who is a distinguished chemist of wide and varied experience. He is a person who not only enjoys a great reputation in Australia, but one who, by reason of his ability and his great work, has a reputation beyond the shores of Australia. Mr. Wilkinson has also the advantage of having devoted special attention to our industries. He has a more extensive knowledge of our industrial undertakings than any other scientific man in Australia, and I hope the whole Federal sphere is to have the benefit of his services as a Principal in this Institute.

MR. TUDOR.—The honorable member admits that it is better to have a practical man than one who is a mere theorist?

SIR ROBERT BEST.—I agree with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tudor) that we do not require merely an academic scientist, but a practical industrial one, and that is what I hope is intended. I believe it is the intention of the Government to obtain the services of practical industrial scientists, who will be employed to stimulate our industries by systematic research.

The Manchester Municipal College of Technology—a great institution, with a wonderful reputation—undertakes industrial research, largely in co-operation with the firms engaged in industry in South-Eastern Lancashire.

MR. TUDOR.—And that includes the whole of the cotton and print mills.

SIR ROBERT BEST.—Yes. The point I am emphasizing is that the college works in co-operation with the various industries, that is one of its special features. It is now realized that it is time the old rule of thumb method was discarded. In days gone by, the average workman was inclined to discredit scientific methods, and to depend entirely upon practical knowledge. But it is amazing now to hear the confessions of a number who held that view in the past, and who now realize that our only hope of salvation is in the application of science to industry.

I am anxious to draw the attention of honorable members to certain resolutions passed by the American Federation of Labour on the question of scientific research. The resolutions are most

suggestive, and the preliminary recitals, amongst other things, state—

Scientific research, and the technical application of results of research, form a fundamental basis upon which the development of our industries, manufacturing, agriculture, mining, and others, must rest.

They refer to productivity in industries, and to the fact that the productivity in industries has greatly increased by the application of the results of scientific research, and show that the only potent factor in dealing with increased productivity and improving the position of the workers is that there should be development in this particular department. They then declare that the war has brought home to all the nations engaged in it the overwhelming importance of science and technology to our national welfare. They then say it is resolved—

That a broad programme of scientific and technical research is of major importance to the national welfare, and should be fostered in every way by the Federal Government, and that the activities of the Government itself in such research should be adequately and generously supported in order that the work may be greatly strengthened and extended.

That is typical of the workers assembled in convention in dealing with this all important and vital subject. In response to the increased interest, both in Great Britain and America—countries which, perhaps, most excite our interest at present—this increased activity has been largely stimulated by the personal interest of the workers themselves. In Great Britain the Government was specially active in the matter of scientific research in relation to national industries during the war, and that activity has since been increased. Lord Moulton, a very distinguished lawyer and student of science, in a preface written to a little book, *Science and the Nation*, written by Mr. A. C. Seward, says—

In every industry there is scope for research, and on it must depend the maintenance of our position in the industrial struggle for existence. Hence there is no training so valuable for industrial life as that of being brought into close contact with those engaged in scientific research, whether it be in University Laboratories or elsewhere. By concentrating the work at our Universities, and making the students see and take part in it, we shall send out into the world a class of men fit for carrying out the industrial research necessary for the maintenance of our position in trade. He realizes, with every thoughtful man, that in these days of keen competition we

must depend for maintenance on scientific research.

The British Government itself, recognising the great necessities of the nation in this direction, have placed aside something approximating a million sterling, and have handed it over to an administrative committee of the Privy Council for scientific and industrial research. Associated with this administrative body are various advisory councils, which consult with the manufacturers—that is the point I am seeking to stress—and others. The result is systematic development of research, and co-operation with science and industry under the direct control of the industries themselves. The special feature is to organize all industrial research in conjunction with the industries, rather than prosecuting the work on a purely scientific basis. The great objective is to arouse the interest of the manufacturers themselves. I am strongly urging that there should be a close connexion and co-operation between the leading Universities, and technical schools and our industries, which rely on research to such an important degree.

The honorable member for Cowper (Dr. Earle Page) dealt at length with the splendid results being achieved in Canada, and I do not intend to refer to them other than to say that a study of the work that has been accomplished there is particularly interesting. In that country certain proposals were made to spend a large sum of money in the creation of a central Institute, and the idea obtained that it was to be run by certain University professors. I happened to come across a criticism of the proposals, urging the wisdom of more attention to practical industrial research rather than investigations carried out on a purely scientific basis. A leading newspaper in Canada says—

It considered it doubtful whether a centrally located academically populated and university inoculated research bureau is the last word in industrial research, as it is questionable if such an atmosphere and such personalities get the hang of what is wanted in actual production.

That is a criticism of a proposal that was before the Canadian Government for the creation of this large Institute, and the

Sir Robert Best.

appointment of mere University professors. That idea was ultimately discarded. Although I have the greatest respect and admiration for our University professors, and whilst I recognise the valuable work they have performed in the interests of science, I must admit that in a matter of this kind, where our industries are vitally concerned, their training does not fit them for the service.

MR. RICHARD FOSTER.—That is what we desire to avoid.

SIR ROBERT BEST.—Yes; and I am glad that that has been embodied in the Bill.

In New Zealand, South Africa, and in India, they are very active; but, perhaps, the most striking example in the whole world is that of Japan. Her expansion in the industrial world has been of a most marvellous character. She has certainly had the benefit of the experience of other nations, and has had the wisdom to adopt what could be successfully applied to her own industries.

MR. RICHARD FOSTER.—She has picked the brains of the world.

SIR ROBERT BEST.—That has been a part of her scheme. To show what has been achieved in the course of a year or two in the electro-chemical industry, I may state that at the beginning of the war it was quite a minor industry, but now its production is in the vicinity of £30,000,000 annually. In the tin plate industry similar results have been achieved. I do not know whether recent financial disturbances have upset their calculations, but it was contemplated by Japan to set apart £1,000,000 for the furtherance of commercial research.

I suppose that nowhere in the world has there been greater activity in this matter than in the United States of America, where colossal sums are spent. If I remember aright, the Federal Government of the United States set aside last year something like £14,000,000 for the carrying on of industrial research work by its own institutions. That expenditure is entirely apart from the expenditure of the various States of the Union, which maintain Departments that perform most valuable work in co-operation and co-ordination with the Federal institutions. No one can take up an American magazine of

any standing without being impressed with the way in which the captains of industry and the leading intellects of industry in that country urge their manufacturers and workers to give the closest attention to these matters. Here, for instance, are a few remarks by the United States Secretary of Commerce, Mr. William Redfield, who, in opening a Reconstruction Congress in December, 1918, said—

Find and seize hold upon all science has said, or can say, concerning industry. It was largely because Germany made her industries the operating end of her sciences that her commerce grew so vast and so powerful. It was more German science than German wages that made her competition dangerous.

The various associations of manufacturers in the States have issued a considerable quantity of literature on this subject, and at one of their recent conferences they indicated that the activity which is being displayed is to be increased. This is what Mr. J. J. Carty, Chief of the Research Department of the United States, said when speaking before the American Institute of Electrical Engineering—

While vast sums are spent annually upon industrial research in these laboratories, I can say with authority that they return to the industries each year improvements in the art, which, taken together, have a value many times greater than the total cost of their production. Money expended in properly directed industrial research, conducted on scientific principles, is sure to bring to the industries a most generous return. I consider it is the high duty of our Institute and every member . . . to impress upon the manufacturers of the United States the wonderful possibilities of economies in their processes and improvements in their products which are gained by the discoveries of science. . . . Those who are the first to avail themselves of the benefits of industrial research will obtain such a lead over their competitors that we may look forward to the time when the advantages of industrial research will be recognised by all. . . . In the present state of the world's developments there is nothing which can do more to advance American industries than the adoption by our manufacturers generally of industrial research, conducted on scientific principles. . . . Pure scientific research, unlike industrial scientific research, cannot support itself by direct pecuniary returns from its discovery.

The lessons taught by the leading public men, and the prominent industrials and scientists of the Mother Country, of the United States, and of Germany are such as we must take to heart.

MR. RYAN.—We all agree with the opinions that you have read, but does the Bill further the objects in view?

Sir ROBERT BEST.—It creates opportunity for their furtherance, provided that the right men are appointed.

Mr. RYAN.—The proviso is an important one.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—Yes, and were I not confident that the Government would appoint the right men, I would not support the Bill so ardently. As many other honorable members desire to speak, it would not be fair to prolong my remarks at this stage.

Mr. JOWETT (Grampians) [2.51].—At the outset I wish to say how very much I appreciate the valuable and eloquent speeches which have been made in support of the Bill; I refer more particularly to those of the honorable member for New England (Mr. Hay), the honorable member for Cowper (Dr. Earle Page), and the honorable member for Kooyong (Sir Robert Best).

Mr. RYAN.—What about the speech of the Minister?

Mr. JOWETT.—I apologize for having omitted to refer to the great opening speech of the Minister for Trade and Customs (Mr. Greene), also those of several other honorable members. I agree with everything that these speakers have said as to the desirability of encouraging scientific research, because I appreciate as much as it is possible to do the services which scientific men have rendered to humanity, in Australia as elsewhere. Provided the money is spent efficiently, I would not begrudge any appropriation for scientific research. But it seems to me that none of the speakers to whom I have referred gave any satisfactory reason for agreeing to the second reading of this Bill, which is in reality a measure to create a new Commonwealth Department. We are not being asked to determine upon the value of scientific research or the desirability of encouraging it; in regard to those matters we are unanimous, but we are being asked to assent to the establishment of a new Commonwealth Department and to make a fresh attack on the functions of the States. The aim of those who support the Bill may be excellent, but the means by which it is proposed to attain it may fall far short of excellence, and, indeed, be entirely bad. I was very much struck by a headline in this morning's *Age*—"Air Craft and Quarantine—New Federal Measure, Commonwealth to have Paramount Authority."

Sir ROBERT BEST.—Those are matters within the jurisdiction of the Federal authority.

Mr. JOWETT.—It is exceedingly kind of the honorable member to anticipate my remarks. I know quite well that under the Constitution those are matters within the jurisdiction of the Federal authority, but I have yet to learn that the matter of education with which this Bill deals is a matter in connexion with which the Commonwealth can claim paramount authority. For all practical purposes a portion of the heading which I have quoted from the *Age* might be applied to this Bill, which deals with the subject of education, and it might be termed, "New Federal Measure—Commonwealth to have Paramount Authority." There seems to be a fixed determination on the part of the Commonwealth Government and many members of this Parliament to assume paramount authority over the State Governments in connexion with matters concerning which we are not given paramount authority by the Constitution.

The whole question involved in this measure is, Whether we are to create a fresh Commonwealth Department for the purpose of making a new invasion upon the functions of the State Governments, at the same time imposing totally unnecessary burdens upon the people, by duplicating Government institutions. There are many instances which might be quoted in which the Commonwealth Parliament has created fresh Departments, and has undertaken functions already covered by the activities of the States. In every one of these instances the taxpayers were promised that if the Commonwealth Government undertook the performance of those functions the State Governments would fall in with their proposals and would not clash with them. To quote a comparatively recent instance of the kind honorable members will recollect that the Commonwealth Government decided to establish Savings Banks all over the country. Members of this Parliament were assured that the States would fall in with the proposal; that they would retire into the background, and permit the State Savings Banks to be run by the Commonwealth authorities.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—That was a disgraceful proposal.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—It was a wicked proposal.

Mr. JOWETT.—My honorable friends may before long be constrained to admit that the measure we are now considering is open to the same objections. It was suggested that the State Governments would cease to perform certain functions when the Commonwealth Government undertook them.

Mr. RILEY.—The State Governments might save money by handing these matters over to the Commonwealth.

Mr. JOWETT.—Unfortunately, the State Governments do not seem disposed to save money in that way. They may not unnaturally say, we have carried out these functions for many years past.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—The honorable member is a good State Rights man.

Mr. JOWETT.—I deny the soft impeachment.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—I should have said that the honorable member is a good statesman.

Mr. JOWETT.—I thank my honorable friend for his explanation. We know that when, in the case to which I have referred, the Commonwealth Government interfered in a matter which was not their concern, the State authorities, so far from falling in with the Commonwealth proposal, did all they possibly could to obstruct them, and established new branches of the State Savings Bank in a large number of towns throughout Australia.

When we appointed a High Commissioner it was intended that he should represent the Commonwealth and also the six States in London. There was to be co-ordination and co-operation, and money was to be saved by the appointment.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—What put that notion into the honorable member's head?

Mr. JOWETT.—Everything I read on the subject did so.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—It was stated over and over again in this House.

Mr. JOWETT.—I was not then a member of this House, but I read what was said about the proposal, and in those days I believed the statements that were made in this House. What has been the result? So far from

co-ordination and economy which were promised as a result of the appointment of a High Commissioner, we find that on a recent occasion, when the High Commissioner invited the States' Agents-General to confer with him in order to determine some matter affecting the destinies of Australia, they refused to attend, because they said that the High Commissioner had no authority to call them together. We know that as a result of the appointment of a High Commissioner the expenditure of the States upon their agencies in London has not been diminished by one farthing. In that case we created a new Commonwealth Department, and yesterday afternoon we learned from the Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook) that this new Department, carelessly and casually authorized by this House, cost the Commonwealth £124,000 last year. Of that amount, £50,000 was spent on Australia House, but £74,000 was the expenditure due to the establishment of the High Commissioner's Office.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—What did we get for it?

Mr. JOWETT.—The honorable member might well ask what Australia has received for that expenditure.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—Order! The honorable member is entitled to make only a passing reference to that matter in discussing this Bill.

Mr. JOWETT.—I shall endeavour to confine my remarks strictly to the Bill. In every instance in which this Parliament has decided to interfere with the ordinary and proper functions of the States, we have been promised economy and co-ordination. But in not one instance have those promises been fulfilled; on the contrary, we have incurred, as a rule, useless additional expenditure.

I have listened with the greatest interest to the records that have been quoted of the march of science and the enormous benefits conferred upon mankind by the investigations of scientific observers; but I have failed to hear one argument to substantiate the claim that by creating a seventh Government Department to deal in Australia with scientific research we shall materially help to attain the object we have in view. The great discoveries which have benefited mankind

have been mainly the result of enthusiastic labours of love of men who have devoted their lives to scientific research; and I was exceedingly sorry to hear an honorable member deprecate, by implication, at all events, the value of the work of men of that class.

Mr. GREENE.—What that honorable member said was that he did not think the energies called forth by this scheme should be expended in abstract scientific research, but that the efforts of the directors should be devoted principally towards obtaining practical results from the application of science to industry.

Mr. JOWETT.—I am glad to hear that explanation. If we look to the genesis of some of the greatest discoveries and inventions ever made, we find that they were the triumphs of men of a scientific turn of mind, who devoted their lives to scientific research—in the hope of some pecuniary reward, I admit, but often unsustained by any monetary support. They aimed at benefiting mankind by their devotion to scientific research, and they succeeded. Under these circumstances, one would have thought that everything possible would have been done by the Government to engage the interest and enthusiastic support of the best scientific research minds of Australia. The Institute has been working for some years under no Statute, but under the control of a Government Department, and it has been assisted by an Advisory Council, comprising some of the ablest scientific men in Australia. Of these, the Chairman (Professor Orme Masson) was not the least renowned for ability in the scientific world. It is well known that some days ago this gentleman resigned his position on the Advisory Council. It may be that he has since been persuaded to withdraw his resignation, and that the result of his action is contained in the Government amendment to reinstate the Advisory Boards, which they had decided to eliminate.

Mr. GREENE.—The amendment does not do that. It provides for the creation of Advisory Boards, but not of the same character as those proposed in the previous Bill. This amendment will make it far easier to secure the co-operation of scientific men.

Mr. JOWETT.—I welcome the Minister's explanation.

The question we have to decide is whether the appointment of a seventh

Government Science Department in Australia, with a Director at its head, is likely to encourage and stimulate research by scientific men. Some light upon this matter is thrown by a press interview with Professor Masson, in which he described what has actually happened in connexion with the Institute. He said—

As a net result of four and a half years' work, I have no faith in politicians.

That is a terrible charge, and perhaps I had better pass over that phase of the letter.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—Perhaps his view is reciprocated.

Mr. JOWETT.—I am afraid that there are some politicians who do not appreciate the work of scientific men. Professor Masson continued—

During that time the Committee has met once a week or oftener, and as an outcome of its labours it has advised the Government regarding various developments.

I wish to show to what extent the Institute, during its existence, seems to have alienated the sympathy and warm-hearted support of scientific men in Australia, instead of having, so to speak, welcomed their assistance. Professor Masson says—

But the treatment of its recommendations has been such as to induce and increase the conviction that the politicians are not in sympathy with the Committee in its desire to lay down lines along which science can profitably be applied to industry.

The Committee has found itself treated more and more as if it were a sub-branch of the Trade and Customs Department. Many times its recommendations have been set aside altogether, or not dealt with for months. Surely, if official departmental heads see fit to take up an adverse attitude, such recommendations should not be rejected without the Committee being given an opportunity to traverse the objections taken.

Mr. TUDOR.—Surely they would not want to put themselves above Parliament?

Mr. JOWETT.—But seeing that they were appointed as an Advisory Committee, they might not unnaturally expect that their advice would be occasionally asked for, even if it were never taken.

Mr. GREENE.—Practically all those recommendations referred to the expenditure of money, and I felt it my duty, until Parliament had authorized the establishment of the Institute, to tell them that they had to go slow.

Mr. JOWETT.—I can only inform the House of what Professor Masson says. He continues—

As it is, the Committee cannot help feeling that its opinion is given less weight than that

of departmental officers. Ministers have taken so little interest in the work of the Committee that they have often felt themselves free from the necessity of even acknowledging recommendations or requests.

Then what follows is of the utmost importance as bearing upon what is likely to happen in the future if the Bill is passed.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—You must remember that that is the statement of one man.

Mr. JOWETT.—He was the Chairman, and is one of the most distinguished scientific investigators in Australia. His views regarding the future, providing that the Government continue on the lines now proposed, and the House passes the Bill as it stands, are interesting. I am not opposing the Bill at all strongly, but wish simply to put forward some views which should make the House pause.

Mr. RYAN.—What does the honorable member mean by "not opposing the Bill strongly"? Would he vote against it?

Mr. JOWETT.—I am not prepared to say that at the present moment. I am seeking light and information. Professor Masson says—

The Government proposals mean the crystallization of the Institute under political control. There is to be a single director, but no good man will accept the position, because he will be subject to a departmental chief. I hold, therefore, that it would be better to crush the movement altogether than to set it going on these lines. It is a reversion to a system which has been utterly discredited in Great Britain, the system of departmental control of scientific endeavour as applied to industry.

That is briefly the case I put forward to induce the Government and the House to pause before they finally commit themselves to the creation of a fresh Department, until, at all events, the Government are able to satisfy the House that the creation of a new Commonwealth Department will mean the disappearance of opposing Departments in the six States.

Mr. WEST.—Professor Huxley, a friend of mine, was asked, "What is science?" and he said it was common sense. From that point of view, how is the honorable member going to vote on this Bill?

Mr. JOWETT.—I am glad to hear that Professor Huxley was a friend of the honorable member for East Sydney. That is one of the finest things I have ever heard attributed to Professor Huxley. He was a great man, but I never realised his real greatness until this moment.

I am as enthusiastic a supporter of giving the utmost possible as-

sistance to science and industry, and the encouragement of research work in every possible way, as any one in Australia can be, but I am not satisfied that on its present lines the Bill will achieve the object which we have been led to suppose it will. I propose to ask the Government to delay its passage until they can give us a satisfactory assurance that there will be real co-ordination between the States and the Federation in this matter. Such co-ordination has been taken for granted in the past so often, and we have been so often completely disappointed, that I feel exceedingly doubtful whether we are likely to obtain it in the future. If in the meantime it be desired to give the utmost encouragement to the application of science to industry, and we certainly ought to give it, there are Departments in the six States at present which can be encouraged, and given financial support if required. I urge the Government to take the matter into full consideration. If they are in a position to give the House an assurance from the various States that the passing of this Bill will not mean the duplication between two rival bodies—the States and the Commonwealth—of those functions now being carried on by the States, the Bill will have my support. I sincerely trust that that assurance will be given at once.

Mr. MATHEWS (Melbourne Ports) [3.23].—I shall not go into the question of the necessity for the application of science to industry, because we all know that it exists, but the position is peculiar. Professor Orme Masson's action in resigning, and the interview with him which we have just heard read, proves how wise the Ministry were not to let him, and those associated with him, do whatever they thought fit, and spend money just as they liked. Unless responsibility in this matter is given to a Minister who is answerable to this House, I shall not support the proposal, because scientists, like military men, would spend money like water to bring into operation what they thought was correct. If they cannot assist without wanting to run the show, they will be useless so far as this idea is concerned. Like the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) I want to stop duplication. I am supporting the Bill generally on the second reading, but in Committee I shall vote against the duplication of any Department, although that is not

because I think the State Departments are doing well. In my opinion they are not doing well, and need stirring up by the Federal Government. While it is necessary to have local bodies to deal with those things with which they are immediately concerned, there is no reason why the work cannot be done by the Commonwealth. There is much that concerns the whole of the States rather than any one in particular, and yet each is carrying on independently. This, of course, does not make for economy. My idea is, not that we should attempt to take from the States any of their powers, but that the Commonwealth should propose the conversion of all the various State activities into one Australian Department, thus relieving the taxpayers from having to find money for what is really a duplication. At a time when we hear so much outcry against extravagance and for economy, I think honorable members on both sides of the House will agree that wherever duplication can be done away with there is warrantable opportunity to practise economy. I suggest to the Government that, having gauged the opinions of honorable members — which appear to be fairly unanimous — it should withdraw this Bill and introduce another that would be more in conformity with the desires generally expressed during the debate. Of course, the present measure was introduced with the best intentions, but difficulties have arisen, not the least of which has relation to Professor Orme Masson. The Government, when introducing a fresh Bill, should make clear to those who may be fearful about the matter that there is no desire to create a new Department, but to take over and co-ordinate the present scattered activities. The sovereign rights of the States do not enter at this point at all. Surely the States would agree to the Commonwealth undertaking the work, seeing that it is the only way in which it can be done efficiently.

The committee of doctors over which, as a member of this Legislature, I had the honour to preside, when drawing up their reports on the causes of invalidity and death, suggested that the Commonwealth should allöcate certain moneys to the different States to combat those two fell diseases, the white and the red plague.

Mr. Mathews.

Those professional gentlemen associated with me asked whether I thought the Government would be prepared to vote a specific amount. I replied that, in view of the nature of the proposal, the Government would probably not hesitate to do so. A sum of £10,000 was placed on the Estimates to deal with the red plague. But the Government of New South Wales, which was attempting to deal with the subject independently, considered that it was doing well enough, and that there was no reason why it should bind itself to the conditions suggested by the Commonwealth authorities.

Our quarantine laws would be much better administered solely by the Commonwealth Government. Last year we witnessed an example of how the States proved careless of the ruin that might have been brought upon Australia as an outcome of their thinking first of their own petty interests.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—In some cases the States were abused for preferring human life to trade.

Mr. MATHEWS.—The Tasmanian authorities went mad on the question, and, after all, did not prevent what they sought to shut out; the whole business was a farce. The River Murray forms a great portion of the border line between New South Wales and Victoria; but what occurred at the Border? The Murray made no difference, and we witnessed a conflict between State and Federal authority. The Commonwealth Government was retarded in its desire to do that which it considered best for the people of Australia.

Whatever we may think of Germany, we must admit that the Germans showed wisdom in their willingness to spend millions upon scientific research; and if Australia desires to make progress her people must be ready to do the same. I again suggest to the Government that this Bill be withdrawn, and that the States be communicated with in order, if possible, to bring about co-operation and so save expensive duplication.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN. (Eden-Monaro) [3.32].—I can see no reason for the antagonism displayed towards this measure by certain honorable members opposite. I fail to appreciate the attitude of honorable members who profess

to represent country districts, particularly in the light of the speech delivered by the honorable member for New England (Mr. Hay). The ostensible reason for the opposition to the Bill has to do with the matter of duplication. That will continue so long as we work under the Constitution as it stands, but I trust that the forthcoming Convention will rid us of our troubles in this respect. Duplication, no matter where it has existed, involves additional burdens on the taxpayer. This measure, however, points to true economy and efficiency. The remarks of the honorable member for New England were highly informative; they were not merely a record of what might be done, but of what has been done. The honorable member himself has given practical proof. He was the owner of the big Berry Estate, in New South Wales, which included some of the richest land in Australia. But, practising the principles which the honorable member expounded when discussing this Bill, he converted that estate into a number of small holdings. All his former tenants became independent farmers—owners of their own broad acres and cottages. Some critics said that in so changing their outlook these people were foolish; but the fact is that they are contented in their independence to-day.

The honorable member for New England has a dozen times endeavoured to demonstrate why men should have the best. He truly says we cannot afford to have anything to do with inefficiency, either in respect of labour or in the matter of the expenditure of capital. Last night the honorable member gave us some startling figures. He stated that, in a dairy herd test in his district recently, the results showed that one cow in one year produced butter worth £8 4s., while another cow gave a return of £72. We all know that a lot of time and money are spent in the advocacy of these theories, but, unfortunately, they are not put into practice very often. We really want less talk and more practical application of sound economic theories, and I look for good results from the establishment of this Institute. For a long time we have been preaching decentralization. What have we done up to the present? Honorable members on both sides of the House are in accord with the policy of breaking up big

estates, so that we may be able to place men, women, and children on land at present occupied by sheep, and substitute the school bell for the cattle bell. So far we have not done very much in that direction. I do not advocate the settlement of our soldiers on land in the "never-never" country. I prefer to see them on estates within the fresh-food zone. These areas will then be converted from sheep runs into smiling homes, and we shall have arrived at the true solution of the problem of utilizing our big estates. It is idle to advocate a policy that virtually places the settlers at the throats of owners of big estates; though I favour taxation, when properly applied, because I believe, if an owner does not put his property to its best use, some pressure should be brought to bear upon him.

MR. RYAN.—Something in the nature of a gentle squeeze?

MR. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—Yes; and I may add that my honorable friend has proved himself to be an expert in that business. It would be as well, perhaps, if we had some of the legislation that he has given us up north. I know the honorable member for West Sydney is with me in my desire to see the big estates, especially those close to our principal markets, cut up for closer settlement, because if we drive our soldiers and other settlers out into the "never-never" country, they will not have much chance of success. And, after all, why should we do that? I have in my mind an estate almost adjoining that owned by the honorable member for New England, who has himself settled about 300 soldiers on the land. It comprises about 1,000 acres, and if made available, I feel satisfied that a soldier could make a good living on 10 acres. This would be much better than offering a man 500 acres away back in a locality from which he is not likely to get transport for his produce. These results, I maintain, will follow the passing of this Bill. We talk about co-operation. What does it mean but recognition of the principle that capital and labour must go hand in hand? Consequently, any scheme that makes that possible, that demonstrates that interests are identical, ought to commend itself to every honorable member.

I regret that there appears to be a desire to block the Bill on the ground

that it might lead to duplication of activities, because this difficulty will adjust itself. Although the framers of our Constitution were wise in their generation, we have discovered the weak links in the chain, and it must be our purpose now to remove them and prevent unnecessary duplication of Commonwealth and State services, so that the burden upon the taxpayer may be lightened. It is idle to tell me that we cannot afford to go on with this proposal. This country, with a common-sense Government, is capable of achieving anything, and if we can make land settlement easier, if we can induce a large number of people to make their homes on the land and become taxpayers of this country, we shall have gone a long way towards the solution of all our present problems. I have no time for the pessimists. This is the greatest country on God's earth, and we can do a great deal if only we go the right way about it. I only wish to God we had a common-sense business-life Government.—

HONORABLE MEMBERS.—Hear, hear!

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I am satisfied we would not get a common-sense Government from honorable members opposite, who have just cheered my remark.

Mr. LAVELLE.—Why not have an election, then?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—We have just had an election, and I am afraid it proved pretty disastrous to the honorable member's party. I remember when I was a boy—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—Order! The honorable member must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I was merely going to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when honorable members talk about an election they remind me of the story that boys in dark places usually whistle to keep their courage up. Honorable members who talk about an election are in the same position. I have fought a good many elections. This is my twenty-ninth year in Parliament, and honorable members opposite, who challenge me on that score, cannot frighten me by talking about an election. I invite any one of them to come to my district and I will take a fall out of him.

Mr. GABB.—What is this—science or industry?

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—The honorable member has been well named.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order! These interjections must cease.

Mr. AUSTIN CHAPMAN.—I am merely replying to interjections by honorable members who seem to be under the impression that I am a little bit nervous. They are mistaken.

Referring again to the Bill, I am surprised at any opposition being offered to it. It will have my strongest support, because it is a step in the right direction. I am quite prepared to leave this matter to the common sense of the people, who may be trusted to penalize those who may be responsible for unnecessary duplication.

Mr. LAVELLE (Calare) [3.44].—I move the following amendment:—

That all the words after the word "now" be left out with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the words "withdrawn until information is furnished to the House as to the probability of harmonious co-operation between the Bureau proposed to be established and existing State activities, and, more particularly until such proof is furnished that the measure will not lead to a great increase of the already heavy burden of taxation by unnecessary duplication of Institutions."

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—More obstruction from the back benches!

Mr. LAVELLE.—I consider that remark offensive, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—If the remark is considered offensive, I must ask the Minister to withdraw it.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I withdraw the remark, but may I substitute, "More proposals for delay"?

Mr. LAVELLE.—I also consider that remark offensive, and ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The honorable member for Calare proposes by his amendment to do what the Minister says—delay the measure.

Mr. LAVELLE.—Yes, I certainly do propose to delay the thrusting of a proposal of this kind on the country and taxpayers—a Bill that will probably be very deeply resented, if passed in the absence of sufficient information. I am satisfied that the Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook) meant something entirely different; and it is in that light I consider his interjection offensive. I

do not regard it as offensive to be accused of delaying the measure until we are given information to justify us in approving of it.

I wish to make it quite clear that I am entirely in favour of the principle of science as applied to industry, and I think that every member who has the best interests of the country at heart is also in favour of it. We have heard a good deal of what has been described as the "myth" of the duplication, which we assert will result, of State and Federal activities. We know perfectly well that in the case of the Savings Banks there has been dissatisfaction and deplorable duplication. While in favour of the principle of science as applied to industry, I maintain that we have not the information at our disposal to enable us to conscientiously vote for the measure. We have heard much of the value and necessity for economy, and it has been said, and rightly, that true economy means the elimination of waste. That is perfectly true; and I would be recreant to the trust placed in me by the electors if I were to cast my vote in favour of this Bill in the absence of necessary information. We ought to be satisfied that this Institute will, in the future, do work of a more beneficial character than has been done in the past.

I have before me a copy of a Melbourne newspaper, dated 13th March, 1920, dealing with this measure. I shall not read the whole of the comment—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. — The honorable member would not be in order in reading newspaper comments on this Bill.

Mr. LAVELLE.—Then I shall give the comments from memory, but I shall have to refer to the newspaper in order to insure my placing the facts accurately before the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. — The honorable member will not be in order in doing that; he must rely on his memory.

Mr. LAVELLE.—The newspaper to which I refer says—

Although the Institute for two years has been spending large sums of public money, it has actually no constitutional existence. A Bill to provide for its establishment was introduced into Parliament last year, but the opposition to it was so manifest that the Government did not attempt to pass the measure—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That is clearly dealing with the Bill, and I must ask the honorable member not to proceed; he must rely on his memory.

Mr. LAVELLE.—I submit that I am dealing with the Institute that has been carried on for some time past, the Institute which this Bill proposes to make permanent; I am not dealing with the Bill itself.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. —The honorable member is reading newspaper comments on the Bill. As a matter of fact, it is not in order to read extracts from newspapers at all. The practice has been allowed to a certain extent, but it is out of order, according to our Standing Orders and the practice of the British House of Commons.

Mr. LAVELLE.—As a new member I hope I shall be allowed a little latitude.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I am giving the honorable member considerable latitude.

Mr. LAVELLE.—I hope you will accept my assurance that I am referring, not to the Bill before the House, but to the Institute as it has been carried on for the last two years.

The newspaper article proceeds—

The funds upon which the Institute has lived have been provided by special appropriations or the Estimates that Parliament was given no opportunity to discuss. Reprehensible and unconstitutional as this course has been, it has had the one advantage of giving the public an opportunity of testing the usefulness of the Institute before Parliament committed itself to any permanent expenditure. Let the Institute be judged by its own record. In the two years of its existence what has it done? It was to have achieved wonders. Under its magic touch no local problem was to remain unsolved. But the prickly pear still grows in Queensland. The blowfly has still to be guarded against by the old methods of sheep dip. The gold mining industry has received not the slightest stimulus. Sparrows still fly west, despite the brilliant idea of stationing sentinels along the railway lines to shoot them. Australian manufacturers still work out their own problems, and if they can find a solution they patent them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I must ask honorable members to moderate their tone in conversation.

Mr. MAHONY.—The Government are arranging for the "gag."

Mr. RYAN.—They might as well complete their disgrace now they have started.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I call attention to the offensive interjection by the honorable member for West Sydney, who, referring to myself and one or two others, says that we might as well complete our “disgraceful” conduct.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If the honorable member for West Sydney made the statement attributed to him, it was a disorderly one, and I must ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. RYAN.—The Minister for the Navy is under a misapprehension; but as he seems to think the remark ought to apply to himself, I withdraw it.

Mr. LAVELLE.—I appeal to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to assist me in proceeding with my remarks.

The newspaper comment goes on—

For all the money that has been spent on the investigations by its innumerable Committees, what discovery has been made that has compensated Australia one penny piece? There has certainly been some valuable material for humour provided by the Institute, as when, for example, it found a substitute for tin plates that cost more than tin plate itself, and when it made the remarkable discovery of a new method for the treatment of alunite that was no more than 600 years old. It also nearly invented a machine for picking cotton, which would have been useful if cotton had grown in a different way to accommodate itself to the peculiarities of the machine, and it has discovered a process for baking bread rapidly, that takes only a few hours longer than the process already used by the bakers. It might have done many more wonderful things had it not been hampered—

Motion (by Mr. GREENE) proposed—
That the question be now put.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—Will you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, be good enough to state the position for the benefit of honorable members who have just entered the chamber? It is inconceivable that honorable members would vote for the “gag” if they knew all the circumstances of the case. I ask you, therefore, to explain the position to them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have already done so.

Mr. PARKER MOLONEY.—When there were only half-a-dozen members present.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If honorable members are absent from the chamber that is not the fault of the Chair.

Question put.	The House divided.
Ayes	33
Noes	17
Majority	16

AYES.

Atkinson, L.	Higgs, W. G.
Bamford, F. W.	Hughes, W. M.
Bayley, J. G.	Jowett, E.
Blundell, R. P.	Lister, J. H.
Bowden, E. K.	Mackay, G. H.
Bruce, S. M.	Marks, W. M.
Cameron, D. C.	Marr, C. W. C.
Chapman, Austin	McWilliams, W. J.
Cook, Sir Joseph	Page, Dr. Earle
Cook, Robert	Poynton, A.
Corser, E. B. C.	Prowse, J. H.
Foster, Richard	Rodgers, A. S.
Francis, F. H.	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Greene, W. M.	Wise, G. H.
Gregory, H.	Tellers:
Groom, L. E.	Burchell, R. J.
Hay, A.	Story, W. H.

NOES.

Blakeley, A.	Maloney, Dr.
Brennan, F.	McDonald, C.
Considine, M. P.	Moloney, Parker
Cunningham, L. L.	Ryan, T. J.
Gabb, J. M.	Tudor, F. G.
Lavelle, T. J.	Watkins, D.
Lazzarini, H. P.	Tellers:
Mahony, W. G.	Charlton, M.
Makin, N. J. O.	Riley, E.

PAIRS.

Watt, W. A.	Anstey, F.
Fleming, W. M.	Catts, J. H.
Bell, G. J.	McGrath, D. C.
Lamond, Hector	Mathews, J.
Maxwell, G. A.	Nicholls, S. R.
Livingston, J.	Page, James
Smith, Laird	Fenton, J. E.
Jackson, D. S.	West, J. E.
Fowler, J. M.	Mahon, H.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question—
put. The House divided.

Ayes	30
Noes	19
Majority	11

AYES.

Atkinson, L.	Jowett, E.
Bamford, F. W.	Lister, J. H.
Bayley, J. G.	Mackay, G. H.
Bowden, E. K.	Marks, W. M.
Bruce, S. M.	Marr, C. W. C.
Cameron, D. C.	McWilliams, W. J.
Chapman, Austin	Page, Dr. Earle
Cook, Sir Joseph	Poynton, A.
Cook, Robert	Prowse, J. H.
Corser, E. B. C.	Rodgers, A. S.
Foster, Richard	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Greene, W. M.	Wise, G. H.
Groom, L. E.	Tellers:
Hay, A.	Burchell, R. J.
Higgs, W. G.	Story, W. H.
Hughes, W. M.	

NOES.

Blakeley, A.
Blundell, R. P.
Brennan, F.
Considine, M. P.
Cunningham, L. L.
Francis, F. H.
Gabb, J. M.
Lavelle, T. J.
Lazzarini, H. P.
Makin, N. J. O.

Maloney, Dr.
McDonald, C.
Moloney, Parker
Riley, E.
Ryan, J. T.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.
Tellers:
Charlton, M.
Mahony, W. G.

PAIRS.

Watt, W. A.
Fleming, W. M.
Bell, G. J.
Lamond, Hector
Maxwell, G. A.
Livingston, J.
Smith, Laird
Jackson, D. S.
Gregory, H.

Anstey, F.
Catts, J. H.
McGrath, D. C.
Fenton, J. E.
Nicholls, S. R.
Page, James
Mahon, H.
West, J. E.
Mathews, J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment negatived.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put. The House divided.

Ayes	27
Noes	16

Majority 11

AYES.

Atkinson, L.
Bamford, F. W.
Bayley, J. G.
Bowden, E. K.
Bruce, S. M.
Cameron, D. C.
Chapman, Austin
Cook, Sir Joseph
Cook, Robert
Corser, E. B. C.
Foster, Richard
Greene, W. M.
Groom, L. E.
Hay, A.

Higgs, W. G.
Hughes, W. M.
Lister, J. H.
Mackay, G. H.
Marks, W. M.
Marr, C. W. C.
Page, Dr. Earle
Poynton, A.
Prowse, J. H.
Ryrie, Sir Granville
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

NOES.

Blundell, R. P.
Brennan, F.
Considine, M. P.
Cunningham, L. L.
Francis, F. H.
Jowett, E.
Lavelle, T. J.
Lazzarini, H. P.
Mahony, W. G.

Makin, N. J. O.
Maloney, Dr.
McDonald, C.
Ryan, T. J.
Tudor, F. G.

Tellers:
Charlton, M.
Watkins, D.

PAIRS.

Watt, W. A.
Fleming, W. M.
Bell, G. J.
Lamond, Hector
Maxwell, G. A.
Livingston, J.
Smith, Laird
Jackson, D. S.
Gregory, H.
Rodgers, A. S.

Anstey, F.
Catts, J. H.
McGrath, D. C.
Mahon, H.
Nicholls, S. R.
Page, James
Fenton, J. E.
West, J. E.
Mathews, J.
Gabb, J. M.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.
Bill read a second time.

In Committee:

Clause 1 agreed to.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT.

WELLINGTON HOSPITAL, NEW SOUTH WALES: MAIL DELIVERY.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES) proposed—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LAVELLE (Calare) [4.16].—
I desire to bring before the House an important matter concerning the non-delivery of mails at the Wellington Hospital, in New South Wales. The question was brought under my notice, and I communicated with the Department. I have since been informed that the mails cannot be delivered to the hospital because it is beyond the postal boundaries. To-day I have received a letter from the secretary of the hospital, which reads—

Dear Sir,

The committee and staff of the Wellington District Hospital, New South Wales, respectfully solicit your aid in helping them to get the mail delivered to the institution. It seems that before the present hospital was erected in 1902, there had been a postal boundary fixed, and the new hospital building lay just outside that boundary. The postal officials tell us that nothing can be done until the present building is placed inside the postal boundary. The hospital is already inside the municipal boundary. We have done our best to get this matter settled amicably, but cannot get any satisfaction, hence this appeal for your assistance.

Mr. BOWDEN.—I draw attention to the state of the House.

There not being a quorum present,

Mr. Deputy Speaker adjourned the House at 4.21 p.m.

Senate.

Wednesday, 28 July, 1920.

The PRESIDENT (Senator the Hon. T. Givens) took the chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBERS.

The PRESIDENT (Senator the Hon. T. Givens) announced the receipt of communications from Senators Crawford and Earle, tendering their resignations as

members of the Joint Committee of Public Accounts.

Motion (by Senator E. D. MILLEN) agreed to—

That Senators Crawford and Earle be relieved from further attendance on the Joint Committee of Public Accounts.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

CHANGES IN CABINET.

Senator E. D. MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.3].—*By leave*—I desire to announce changes made in the Ministry in consequence of the resignation of the Right Honorable W. A. Watt, who held the portfolio of Treasurer. His Excellency the Governor-General has been pleased to appoint the Right Honorable Sir Joseph Cook, G.C.M.G., as Treasurer; the Honorable William Henry Laird Smith, as Minister for the Navy; and Mr. Arthur Stanislaus Rodgers as Honorary Minister.

HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—I wish to ask whether the Leader of the Government in the Senate has observed that it is reported in the press that Mr. Storey, Premier of New South Wales, in addressing a deputation, said:—

Unless all sections of the community helped, they would have a Black Wednesday. The Government had no money, and its obligations were enormous. He could not see where the money to meet Federal and State obligations was to come from.

If the honorable senator has noticed that statement, does he think it a wise thing to appoint a quasi-Ambassador to the United States of America, at further very large expenditure?

Senator E. D. MILLEN.—I have seen the statement quoted. I hope that Mr. Storey will himself take to heart the lesson he has been preaching; but I fail to see its relevance to the suggested appointment of a Commissioner to America.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—Where is the money to come from?

Senator E. D. MILLEN.—Economy does not always, or necessarily, consist in the avoidance of expenditure which may prove to be profitable.

REPATRIATION.

CASE OF MR. H. L. PRATT.

Senator FOLL.—Is the Minister for Repatriation aware whether Mr. H. L. Pratt, of Brisbane, has been refused assistance by the Repatriation Department to complete his studies as a theological student? In view of his assurance that assistance would be granted when it could be proved that such studies had commenced prior to enlistment, will the Minister give instructions that will insure assistance being given in this case?

Senator E. D. MILLEN.—Senator Foll is aware that a Bill was recently passed here placing the consideration of such cases in the hands of a Repatriation Commission. I suggest that the honorable senator should place the matter to which he has referred before the Repatriation Commissioners.

Senator FOLL.—Does that mean that the Minister for Repatriation has no power at all?

Senator E. D. MILLEN.—I do not propose to override the Repatriation Commission in matters of that kind.

PAPERS.

The following papers were presented:—

Public Service Administration—Report of Royal Commission (Mr. D. C. McLachlan).

War Service Homes Act—Land acquired at—

Bexley, New South Wales.

Waratah, Newcastle, New South Wales (two notifications).

Customs Act.—Proclamation, dated 14th July, 1920, revoking proclamation of 23rd September, 1914, relating to the exportation of Mares.

Excise Act.—Regulations amended—Statutory Rules 1920, No. 121.

Iron and Steel Bounty Act.—Regulations—Statutory Rules 1920, No. 122.

PROPERTY OF GERMAN INTERNEES.

Senator DE LARGIE (for Senator GARDINER) asked the Leader of the Government in the Senate, *upon notice*—

1. Is it the intention of the Government to release the moneys belonging to German internees who have been released?

2. If so, when?

3. Peace having been proclaimed with Germany, would it be an offence for persons to enter into an agreement with released internees with regard to these moneys?

Senator RUSSELL. — The answers are—

1. The question of releasing the moneys of German internees who have been released from the charge referred to in regulation No. 20 of the Treaty of Peace Regulations is at present under consideration, and each case is being considered separately.

2. See reply to No. 1.

3. Yes, until the release referred to in question No. 1 shall have been granted.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS: MEETINGS.

Motion (by Senator E. D. MILLEN) agreed to—

That, in accordance with the provisions of the Commonwealth Public Works Committee Act 1913-1917, Senators Foll, Newland, and Plain be appointed members of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works.

Senator E. D. MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [3.10]. —By leave, I move—

That until further ordered, so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent any sectional Committee of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works from holding meetings while the Senate is sitting.

The reason I have moved this motion without giving notice of it is that a sectional Committee of the Works Committee is already proceeding to Western Australia, and will sit there to-morrow. Had I delayed this motion until to-morrow, it would have been too late to enable honorable senators to attend and share in the work of the Committee.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

PAPUA BILL.

SECOND READING.

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [3.11].—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends section 20 of the Papua Act 1905, but does not in any way amend the principles of the existing Constitution of Papua. The object is to get over a difficulty which has been created by a part of the existing Act. The Commonwealth Parliament in 1905 decided when establishing the Constitution of Papua that no further land in that Territory should be alienated. The idea was that all land there should in the future be held on leasehold. The fact was overlooked that a

man named Wickham had, previous to 1905, secured from the British Commission, which was then administering British New Guinea, a twenty-five years' lease, at a nominal rent, with the option of purchase at about 5s. per acre at any time during the currency of the lease, of some small islands called the Conflict group. Either the Commonwealth had no record of this contract, or ignored its existence when passing the Papua Act, with its prohibition against the alienation of further land. Only one case is involved, and, to meet it, it is proposed to insert in paragraph *a* of section 20 of the Papua Act, after the words "disposed of," the words "except in pursuance of rights of purchase acquired under the law of British New Guinea before the commencement of this Act." After the Act was passed, Mr. Wickham demanded his title, and it was agreed that he should be granted the fee-simple according to his contract; but we found that we had legislated in such a way that it was impossible for us to grant the fee-simple without remedying the technical defect in the existing legislation. A dispute arose, not about the granting of the land, because that had been definitely promised, but about the area. The Government were wrongly informed that it comprised 3,000 acres. Mr. Wickham would not sign the contract for 3,000 acres, and subsequently, after investigation and survey, the area turned out to be only 1,800 acres. A contract having been deliberately entered into by the British Government, I do not think it was the intention or desire of this Parliament to cancel it.

Senator DUNCAN.—Would not he be willing to accept compensation?

Senator RUSSELL.—That might be a way out of the difficulty, but he has shown no desire for compensation; he simply wants the contract carried out. A contract made with a Government should be regarded as sacred, and carried out, although I am not enthusiastic about alienating further land in Papua. We feel bound to honour the contract which was deliberately made at the time, and we are introducing no new principle into our legislation. I have been through the whole of the facts, and find that an obvious mistake was made by the officers of the Department of that day. Parliament should not, by a subterfuge or mistake, deprive a man of any rights which

he holds under a contract with the British Government.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time, and committed *pro forma*.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS BILL.

SECOND READING.

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [3.18].—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

There is no vital principle involved. The object of the measure is largely to correct mistakes made in previous drafting, and, as far as possible, to facilitate the work under the Act of 1905. Under that Act, it is provided that at midnight on a certain day the head of the household is responsible for filling in correctly the details demanded on the Census card. It is also provided that boats, other than Australian coastal boats, if they are at a port, have to supply the Census particulars; but if they are sailing between two Australian ports they have not to do so. This seems to be unfair, because those on board, even if they are not Australians, are for the time being actually living in Australia, getting their living here, and participating in the general work of the community. We provide, therefore, in order to make the law uniform, that, irrespective of whether the boat is British or otherwise, Census returns have to be made so long as the boat is in Australian waters at the time. I think that is a sound proposition.

Another difficulty is that under the Act as it stands people assisting in the collection of Census particulars in scattered districts are supposed, in order to insure fealty and secrecy, to make an affidavit before a Commissioner for taking affidavits. There may not be such a Commissioner within hundreds of miles, and as no great responsibility is involved, we believe that the method should be modified and permission given for a declaration to be taken before any responsible witness in such circumstances.

Senator KEATING.—Under this proposal a man may make a declaration without a witness?

Senator RUSSELL.—Yes, that is so. Another point has arisen, owing to faulty draftsmanship in the original Act. Under this measure authority is given for the collection of certain information, but

there is no legal provision for its publication, and, as the information is obtained for this purpose, we desire to authorize the Chief Census Officer to obtain and prepare such information for publication. It would also appear that heavy penalties are to be imposed in respect of several technical offences, whereas the intention was to confine the imposition of this penalty to one particular section of the Act. In this Bill it is proposed to make the limitation definite, because there is no desire to impose heavy penalties for minor breaches. Then, again, there is no obligation upon the licensee of an hotel or keeper of a boarding house to observe secrecy in connexion with the taking of a census, and it is thought to be very desirable to remedy the Act in this particular. Other matters referred to are questions of detail which can be better dealt with in Committee.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time, and committed *pro forma*.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from 22nd July (*vide* page 2909), on motion by Senator PEARCE—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Senator THOMAS (New South Wales) [3.25].—I am very pleased that, at last, the Government have made a beginning with the long promised amendment of the Public Service Act. I am employing no exaggerated language when I say that there is a great deal of unrest and disorganization throughout the Public Service at the present time. This, of course, is only to be expected, because there is a considerable amount of unrest in the general community as the aftermath of the war, and, of course, the Public Service is likewise affected. But much of this unrest could have been averted by the proper organization of the Department. For many years now we have had an Acting Public Service Commissioner, and most of his officers have been doing administrative work in an acting capacity. I have brought this question before the Senate on several occasions. When last I referred to it, the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) was good enough to inform the Senate that one of the reasons

why we should have an Acting Commissioner and staff was that the Government were contemplating making some alterations in the Public Service Act, and, as the Public Service Commissioner's appointment was for seven years, it would be undesirable to make the appointments in view of the pending alterations contemplated. The Acting Commissioner has now been "acting" for over five years, and still we have had no alteration in the Act. I believe that, if a Commissioner had been appointed, instead of an Acting Commissioner, and if he had been assisted by a properly appointed staff, even if we had to compensate the Commissioner and his staff, the money would have been well spent by giving them, if necessary, full pay for the unexpired term of their office.

The most ungenerous critics of the Government cannot say that there has been any undue haste in the amendment of the Public Service Act. Two Bills have now been circulated. We have to thank the Minister for Defence for his lucid second-reading speeches. I thought at first that these Bills were the measures referred to, but I find that there is still another, and the main Bill, to be dealt with. These are preliminary measures, no doubt important in their way, but it appears to me that if we pass them before we know definitely what are the intentions of the Government with regard to their main Bill, we shall be placing the cart before the horse. The Senate is legitimately entitled to know approximately the number of civil servants and the number of Departments that are to come under the proposed Board of Management, and those which are to be exempt. The Bill we are now discussing purports to dispense with the Public Service Commissioner, and appoint in his place a Board; and if that is so, we should be given some information on the lines I have indicated. When dealing with the other measure relating to the Public Service, the second reading of which has already been moved, we should also be supplied with similar particulars. There are some Departments that cannot be dealt with by the proposed Board of Management unless there is an amendment of the principal Act; and if we hand over to the proposed Board only those Departments that are now under

the Act, we can deal only with those Departments now controlled by the Public Service Commissioner, and not those that are exempt. This information should be at our disposal before we are asked to agree to the appointment of a Board.

I desire to say, quite frankly, that I stand for the Public Service Act in its fundamentals and essentials, and honorable senators who have been here for the last three years will admit that on every occasion when I have had the opportunity I have championed its provisions. The principal Act is twenty years old, and we have to remember that it was framed by a Parliament composed of men representing States where no Public Service Act was in force, and others where there was legislation with differing provisions. During the course of twenty years, many situations have arisen which have necessitated an amendment of the principal measure.

Senator FOLL.—Have those Departments that have not come under the Act proceeded satisfactorily?

Senator THOMAS.—I am not dealing with those Departments that do not come under the Public Service Act; but, in the main, I think the measure has worked fairly well. The fact that the Government propose to appoint a Board of three in place of a Commissioner shows that there is need of some change. I am strongly in favour of a permanent staff, because I believe that when men have a security of tenure they are more likely to perform their work more efficiently. In the Government Service, however, there is more reason why we should provide for continuity of employment than in other work, because the experience gained in Government Departments, especially in those under the control of the Public Service Commissioner, is of very little use to a civil servant if he should seek employment elsewhere. If, for instance, a letter-carrier, or sorter, a telegraphist or a postmaster, was dismissed, or for some other reason had to leave the Service, it would be difficult for him to find suitable employment elsewhere. A miner, an engineer, or any experienced tradesman, on leaving employment in one service can very easily find work elsewhere; but that is not so in the case of Government officials. It therefore behoves us, as a Parliament, to protect our servants by

providing that their employment shall be continuous. On the other hand, Parliament has the right to see that the interests of the general public are conserved by maintaining an efficient Service, and it is the duty of Parliament, as far as possible, to see that these two interests are protected.

I do not hesitate to say that in the matter of dismissals the rights and interests of those in the Service should be most zealously and rigidly protected.

Senator PEARCE.—Their dismissal is practically impossible.

Senator THOMAS.—Perhaps the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) will permit me to explain. There may be honorable senators present who may not have had the opportunity of closely studying the legislation covering the Public Service that has been passed during recent years. When a person in the Public Service is deemed to be inefficient, he is suspended by the head of his Department; and in this connexion I may quote as an illustration the case of a letter-carrier. He is held to be inefficient. The Deputy Postmaster-General may send him before an Appeal Board consisting of three members of the Public Service, one of whom must be a representative of the Division to which the accused officer belongs. This representative is elected to the position by the members of his own Branch once in every three years. Consequently the accused person is practically appealing to a tribunal consisting of three fellow employees, one of whom is the elected representative of his Division. In such circumstances it is obvious that at least one vote will be cast in favour of the alleged inefficient. Experience, too, has shown that it is very difficult indeed to induce one of the other two members constituting the Board to affirm that he is inefficient. As a result he is restored to the Service, and the Commonwealth has to pay him for the time that he has been under suspension.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—That is rather an alarming state of things.

Senator THOMAS.—I am merely stating what is the law at present. To my mind, the existing position does not tend to efficiency. Again, there are quite a number of officers in our Public Service who are deemed to be inefficient by their superior officers, but who are not cited to

appear before an Appeal Board for the simple reason that those superior officers know that that Board would not declare them to be inefficient. I will quote a case which is typical of my argument. Some time ago I had the pleasure of being a colleague of the present Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) in the Government of that day, and I have a very vivid recollection that the secretary of the Department over which I presided used frequently to come to me with a request that a very prominent officer of the general staff should be allowed to visit one of the States for the purpose of dealing with some matter of moment. So pronounced did this practice become that at length I began to wonder whether this particular officer on the general staff did not desire to fill in a week-end somewhere. Accordingly I remarked to the secretary of the Department, "It looks as if this were a sort of week-end business. Cannot the officer in the particular State that is concerned deal with this work?" and I was told "No, he cannot be trusted." Thereupon I remarked, "Then he is not fit for his job," to which the secretary replied, "I admit that. I confess that he is inefficient." I then said to the secretary, "That being so, why do you not suspend him?" His answer was, "I will suspend him if you like. All that you have to do is to say that he is to be suspended, and I will go before the Appeal Board and testify that in my judgment he is inefficient. The head of his own Branch at the central office will say that in his opinion he is incapable of satisfactorily discharging his duties. But I want you to understand exactly what will happen. He will be tried by the Board appointed for the purpose, and the chances are ninety-nine or a hundred to one that two of the number of that body will say that he is efficient. Consequently he will have to be restored to his office; and where then will be your position as Minister and my position as secretary of the Department?" In the circumstances it was useless for me to proceed further.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—Who are the other two members of the Board?

Senator THOMAS.—I have already explained that all three members of that body are civil servants. One of those members is elected by the officers of the Branch to which the accused belongs. In

our Public Service there are three Divisions, namely, the Clerical Division, the Professional Division, and the General Division. The Clerical and General Division once in three years elect their own representatives to this Board. Like most representatives he desires to be re-elected, and the result is that instead of acting in a judicial capacity he invariably becomes an advocate.

Senator FOLL.—If the Appeal Board found against an accused officer it would be practically passing a vote of censure upon the head of his Department.

Senator THOMAS.—Exactly. I know of cases in which the Deputy Postmaster-General has sent postmen before the Appeal Board on a charge of inefficiency, but the Board has declared them to be efficient, with the result that they have had to be restored to their employment. I recollect one instance in which an officer had been found guilty of pilfering through the Customs Department—

Senator PEARCE.—He had been convicted by the Courts.

Senator THOMAS.—Yes; then after that, he was brought before the Appeal Board, which affirmed that he had done no wrong, and so far as I know, he is still in the Public Service of the Commonwealth. Although he had been convicted in the Courts of the country of pilfering, the Board declared that he was not guilty of that offence, and we had no power to dismiss him. These are matters of very serious moment. It is fair to assume that, no Board worthy of the name will undertake the management of a big service unless its members know beforehand precisely the powers with which they are to be invested for the purpose of enabling them to satisfactorily discharge their duties.

When it was decided to establish the Commonwealth Bank, Mr. Fisher, the then Prime Minister and Treasurer, had to look about him to discover a man suitable for the position of General Manager of the Bank. He was extremely fortunate in being able to secure the services of Sir Denison Miller. But what did Sir Denison Miller say before he accepted the appointment? He said, "I want to know the Act of Parliament under which I am to work." The Act was shown to him, and he accepted the position of Governor of the Bank upon

the condition that there was to be no alteration of the Act without his consent. Of course, Parliament could alter the Act if it pleased, but he would then be in a position, if he did not approve of the alteration, to resign and draw full pay for the remaining years of the seven years' term for which under the Act he was originally to be appointed. Sir Denison Miller had a reputation as a banker to maintain, and very naturally he declined to undertake the management of the Commonwealth Bank without knowing exactly what powers he would have to carry out the duties intrusted to him.

It is generally understood that Mr. Curchin is, for some reason unknown to me, shortly leaving the Federal Service, and the New South Wales Government have been trying to secure his services to supervise shipbuilding on their behalf. Some difficulty has arisen in connexion with his engagement by the New South Wales Government, and I understand that it is due to the fact that Mr. Curchin requires to know what powers he will have before he accepts the appointment offered to him. It is very reasonable that he should make such a demand, because he has to consider his reputation as a shipbuilder, and he may feel that, unless he is invested with certain powers, he will not be able to successfully perform the duties of his office.

I have no doubt that it would be possible to find men willing to accept without any conditions positions as members of the proposed Board of Management of the Public Service by offering them £700 or £1,000 a year; but if we are to secure men of the type we require they shall need to know definitely the powers which will be given to them to enable them to carry out their work. The Minister may reply that no man will accept appointment as a member of the proposed Board until he knows what its powers are to be; but, in my opinion, we, as senators creating the Board, should not pass this Bill until we are informed as to the extent of its duties and powers. A private individual will object to take charge of a big concern unless he knows the scope of his duties, and the powers he will have, because his personal reputation may be at stake. We have

our reputation as legislators at stake, and if we pass this measure without knowing exactly what it is intended to effect, we may not only lose the little reputation we have, but we may legislate in a way which may involve the squandering of millions and bring unhappiness to a great many people. Before I agree to the appointment of the Board, I want to know exactly what work it will be called upon to perform. Are we or are we not prepared to scrap a good deal of the machinery of the existing Public Service Act?

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—Various powers are given under clause 11 of the Bill.

Senator THOMAS.—That is so; but can we say that efficiency will be secured in the Public Service by the exercise of the powers given under that clause?

Senator KEATING.—Clause 11, on the face of it, is supplementary.

Senator THOMAS.—Precisely. We shall only learn what the powers of the proposed Board will be when the provisions of the main Public Service Bill are before us.

How many watertight compartments are there to be in our Public Service? We know that there is a tendency to establish such Departments. Under the Audit Bill, which we were recently considering, it is proposed to restrict the powers of the Public Service Commissioner over that Department. Will the proposed Board of Management have the same powers over the Audit Department as the Public Service Commissioner has under the existing Act, or is it intended that that Department shall be exempt from the supervision of the proposed Board? We know that some persons have very strongly advocated that the Postmaster-General's Department should be removed from all control by the Public Service Commissioner.

Senator KEATING.—Some ex-Postmasters-General have recommended that.

Senator THOMAS.—We know that Mr. Webster, an ex-Postmaster-General, was very strongly in favour of the adoption of that course. In view of the fact that the Government are proposing a Board of Management instead of a single Commissioner, it may perhaps be assumed that it is not the intention to remove Departments of the Public Service from the control now exercised by the Public Service Commissioner.

Senator PEARCE.—I may set the honorable senator's fears at rest by saying that it is proposed to extend the powers of the Board of Management beyond those of the existing Public Service Commissioner.

Senator THOMAS.—We must not forget that after the Bill leaves the Senate some provisions of which we approve may be rejected in another place. The Minister for Defence, in dealing with the powers of the proposed Board of Management to secure the efficiency of the public Departments, said that the Board would be granted powers that are not vested in the present Public Service Commissioner. I should like to know whether these extended powers to be given to the Board of Management are to be exercised in respect of the Departments now under the Public Service Commissioner, or is the Board to have powers of supervision, inspection, or investigation over other Departments such as the Defence Department, which is not, under the existing law, subject to the Public Service Commissioner?

Senator PEARCE.—The Defence Department will not be excluded.

Senator THOMAS.—I am glad to hear that; but I think that it should be definitely embodied in the Bill. Will the proposed Board of Management have powers over the Repatriation Department? We have just appointed a Commission of three members to take charge of that Department, and I should like to know whether the Board of Management will have the right to go to the Repatriation Department and seek to discover whether that Department has been spending money properly or not? Is this Board to supervise the work of the three newly-appointed Commissioners, who, I suppose, represent the cream of the applicants for those positions?

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—What about the Audit Department?

Senator THOMAS.—The consideration of the Audit Bill has been dropped for the present, but it would be interesting to know whether the proposed Board of Management will exercise any supervision over that Department.

I have on several occasions asked for Mr. McLachlan's report on the Public Service. In asking for it last week I said that we should have the report before we took up the consideration of these Public Service Bills. I wish to exonerate the

Minister for Defence from any blame in this connexion, because it was my mistake to assume that the two first Public Service Bills introduced were the important measures dealing with the subject. I admit that, for the purpose of considering the two Bills now before it, it is immaterial whether we have read Mr. McLachlan's report or not. It is with the matters to be contained in the Public Service Bill yet to be introduced that Mr. McLachlan's report will be of most value. The report is now available to us, but until the new Bill is introduced we shall not know to what extent the Government have accepted Mr. McLachlan's suggestions.

Senator PEARCE.—That is what we always said when honorable senators were pressing for the report to be laid on the table. We said that it would be of very little use to them until we were ready to submit the Public Service Bill.

Senator THOMAS.—As Mr. McLachlan's report has been in the hands of the Government for two years it cannot be said that the Government have been rushed in connexion with its consideration. I do not think that it is a report which should be flung on the table one day, and that next day we should be called upon to deal with the measure with which it is concerned. Until we know exactly what is contained in the main Public Service Bill we must remain absolutely in the dark as to the notice which has been taken of Mr. McLachlan's recommendations. I do not ask that the Bill now under consideration should be delayed until we have an opportunity of digesting Mr. McLachlan's report, but I do ask that it should not be allowed to pass the second-reading stage merely until we know the provisions of the main Bill, but until that Bill has been considered by both Houses and has become an Act of this Parliament. Until we know what the main Bill will finally contain we shall be unable to say exactly what duties the Board of Management, provided for in the Bill now under consideration, will be called upon to perform.

I have dealt with the subject of dismissals from the Public Service. Another matter of very great importance is the condition upon which people may enter the Service. Entry into the Public Service under the existing Act is by competitive examination. I stand very strongly for the continuance of that policy. I do

not believe in the exercise of personal, social, or political influence to secure admission to the Public Service. When I say that I stand strongly for the policy of examination, I do not mean that I am committed exactly to the present system. It is obvious that after twenty years' experience it may have been discovered that that system is capable of modification and improvement. To this I do not object, but I want to know whether there is to be any alteration, and, if so, what, or whether the system of entrance by examination is to continue exactly as it was before. I should rather have liked to discuss more particularly some parts of this Bill, but I have purposely foregone my right to do so, because I feel that, until we see the other Bill of which I spoke, and until that other Bill becomes an Act of Parliament, every senator who discusses this Bill will be doing so in the dark. I wish to say in general terms that I favour the principle of this Bill on three conditions. I cannot say that I support it until I know exactly what is going to happen under the succeeding Bill. If that Bill brings practically all the present civil servants under the Act, and if there is to be an amendment of the section dealing with dismissals—because, while we ought fully and zealously to guard the legitimate rights of the employees, the law ought not to be so rigid as to prevent the dismissal of an inefficient employee—and if, also, entrance to the Public Service is to continue on somewhat similar lines to the present, although it need not necessarily be actually the same word for word, then, granting those three points, I shall be in favour of this Bill.

In what I am about to say now I am afraid that I shall stand almost alone so far as the Senate is concerned. I know that the Senate has the same right as the House of Representatives to initiate legislation, except in the case of money Bills. My view is that that right ought not to be used very often. I look upon the Senate, not only as the custodian of the rights of the States—which is an important function in itself—but as a second Chamber charged with the duty of review. It is our duty to deal with Bills calmly, coolly, and dispassionately when they come to us from another place, where they have had to go through the heat and passion of partyism. If we are

to continue to pass Bills for another Chamber to review; we shall be placing ourselves upon the level of that Chamber. If we carry out our true function of revision of legislation coolly and leisurely, then, when a Bill has passed through our hands and become an Act of Parliament, it will be as nearly perfect as human wisdom and ingenuity can make it. But if we initiate legislation and send it down to another place for revision by them, we not only lower the dignity of this Chamber, but furnish another strong reason for doing away with the Senate altogether.

I should like to know what we are called upon to appoint a Board of Management to do. It will depend upon one or two of the matters which I have pointed out whether the Board is to be a useless and expensive, or a very useful, body. If we grant to these three men no more power than is granted to the Commissioner, even the payment of salaries of £10,000 a year will not make the Board effective, although its members may be good men personally. I remember quoting some words uttered by Mr. Webster, the ex-Postmaster-General. We must all admit that Mr. Webster made a very honest effort to obtain efficiency in the Service, although I do not hold with all he did, or with many of his methods. Yet, we must give him credit for the efforts he made towards efficiency. He said on one occasion that "There were a number of inefficient in the Service holding prominent positions; he knew them, and he intended to dismiss them." When I quoted those words of his, I said, "He will not be able to do it. It is too big a task for him. He has not the power to do what he says." I do not know who those inefficient are, but not one of them has been dismissed. Every one of them is still in the Service, and likely to remain there. To show that this is no new matter so far as I am concerned, I may be pardoned for mentioning that when I was Postmaster-General Mr. Fisher, the then Prime Minister, suggested to me on more than one occasion that we should engage the ablest man we could get at a high salary to act as an organizer of the Post and Telegraph Department. I replied on each occasion that until the Public Service Act was amended to enable such a man to deal with the inefficient in the Service I was

Senator Thomas.

not prepared to spend the money to secure him, because I felt that under existing conditions, even if we paid the ablest organizer available £10,000 a year, he would be powerless. I take it that we shall have to offer considerable salaries in order to get the type of men we want to constitute the proposed Board. Even if we grant them the power to do what we want them to do, they will not be ordinary men, and cannot be easily found. I have no objection to the payment of good salaries in order to secure men who are able to do the work, because, after all, that is the cheapest way to get things done, but unless we grant them full power to carry out their ideas it will be a waste of money to appoint them. We might just as well allow the old machine to rumble along under medium-paid men as appoint a highly-paid Board to try to do impossibilities. In view of these considerations, I sincerely trust that this Bill will not be proceeded with and passed before the other Bill is before us.

Senator KEATING (Tasmania) [4.15].

—With very much of what Senator Thomas has said about this measure generally, and our proceeding with it, I am in accord; but I entirely dissociate myself from the sentiment underlying one of his objections to our dealing with it at the present time. I refer to his doubt of the expediency of the Senate originating legislation of this character. He argued that if a certain procedure were followed our legislation might be expected to go forth in the best form possible. I venture to question that assertion. The history of this Parliament shows that in its earlier days much of the fundamental legislation of the Commonwealth, including the Public Service Act itself, was originated in this Chamber, and if the records of the Courts be investigated it will be found that legislation which originated in this Chamber has stood the test of time and criticism far better than any other legislation on the statute-book.

Now, as to this measure and its narrow scope—I use the word "narrow," not as referring to the policy incorporated in the measure, but to indicate that it touches only one feature of the administration of the Public Service—I am at a loss to understand why the Government, in introducing Public Service legislation,

confine themselves, as they have done in this case, to one single feature, namely, that of general control. Practically the whole of this measure resolves itself into the simple proposition that, instead of the Public Service in the future being administered as heretofore by a Commissioner, it should be administered by a Board. The different provisions of this measure deal with the constitution of the Board, the delegation of its authority, and certain functions that it shall exercise.

Senator PEARCE.—Which are not exercised by the Public Service Commissioner.

Senator KEATING.—The functions outlined in this measure are contained in a clause which is not exclusive. That is to say, it does not represent the whole of the functions which the Board will exercise. It is simply supplementary, conferring upon the Board new functions which hitherto have not been exercised by the Commissioner. It is to be presumed that when the Board comes into existence it will exercise, not only these additional functions, but also those now and heretofore exercised by the Commissioner. Clause 11, therefore, is not exclusive. It is supplementary, or additional, to the functions of the present administrative authority.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—That ought to be made clear in the Bill.

Senator KEATING.—I think it is clear enough.

Senator PEARCE.—It is made clear in the schedule.

Senator KEATING.—The powers outlined in clause 11 are added to those now exercised by the Commissioner, but that is only a feature of the new system of administration proposed, and the Bill, in effect, simply substitutes a new system of control for the existing system.

As Senator Thomas indicated, the Public Service Act covers a large number of subjects, many of which are not touched by this Bill or by the Arbitration Bill which accompanies it. The main provisions of the Public Service Act are not touched, either in this Bill or in the other measure introduced by the Minister last week. Those provisions, we are led to believe, will be touched by another, or several other Bills, to be submitted subsequently. I am at a loss to understand why the Government have adopted this procedure.

Like Senator Thomas, I have endeavoured for some years to get an assurance from the Government as to when legislative attention would be given to conditions in the Public Service. I agree with Senator Thomas that for some years past, not because of any inherent defect in legislation, but due rather to the changed conditions under which we all find ourselves, there has been a considerable amount of unrest and apprehension throughout the Public Service. There is a feeling that our legislation has not been kept up to date; that, so to speak, it has become out of step with the changed conditions of recent years; and, like Senator Thomas, I have been endeavouring to ascertain when ameliorative legislation was likely to be introduced. In fact, one of my questions was as to the advisability of introducing such legislation in this Chamber, in view of the fact that another House would be called upon to deal with the Tariff and other important matters which could not be originated here; but the reply given to me was like so many of those characteristically evasive answers furnished by Ministers. Therefore, I came to the conclusion that one of the reasons why the Government did not care to originate such legislation here was that it would contain a scheme of monetary provisions, such as those dealing with superannuation, which might possibly prevent its origination in this branch of the Legislature. In the measure now before the Senate there will be monetary provision for members of the proposed Board; but those places in the clause dealing with this particular matter have been left blank, so that the amounts might be filled in elsewhere.

Stronger justification than has been given by the Minister should be forthcoming to justify this system of legislation by instalments. We are asked to legislate in piecemeal fashion on a very important matter—important not merely to the officers of the Service, but equally important to the whole of the Commonwealth, and I think there is a great deal of force in Senator Thomas's argument that before we commit ourselves to changing the present system of administration by a Commissioner to administration by a Board, we should have some information as to the functions exercisable by this proposed

Board, and to what extent the general legislation will affect the new Service and the new *régime*. We have provisions in the existing measure dealing with suspensions, dismissals, promotions, transfers, furlough, leave of absence, and various other matters of that kind. Around every one of these questions there has been a great deal of discussion at some time or other. No matter what authority we create for the Public Service administration to the extent we legislate and lay down principles, rules, and laws for the carrying on of the Service, to that extent will the functions and authority of the Board be limited. For this reason we should have some idea of the limitations that may be imposed on the Board in the exercise of its functions.

Senator SENIOR.—In effect, we are asked to appoint a general manager before we know what his duties will be.

Senator KEATING.—The present proposal amounts to that. Senator Thomas has suggested that we should pass the main Bill before the measure now under consideration. He may be right, but I would be satisfied if the Government circulated the principal measure so that we would have information as to their intentions. No doubt the Government hold the view that this system of legislating by instalments will expedite consideration of the whole problem. I believe expedition will be assured by the circulation of the principal amending Bill.

Senator THOMAS.—It would make the debate on these Bills more intelligent anyhow.

Senator KEATING.—Yes, and I believe it would lead to their more expeditious treatment. It is obvious that in the consideration of this Bill honorable senators will be unable to ramble into all those fields of debate open to them when considering the principal measure; and it will be impossible to introduce amendments that are not relevant to the scope of the Bill, namely, control and control only. For that reason I think the Government might very well circulate the principal Bill, so that in the debate upon the two measures now before the Senate we may know exactly what we are doing.

Senator Thomas made reference to the Public Service Commissioner's report, which, I believe, has been in the hands

of the Government for about two years. I can quite understand that the Government have not had an opportunity of dealing exhaustively with it, because, while nearly two years have elapsed since the signing of the armistice, there has been an immense amount of legislative and administrative work to be cleared up after the war. I do not blame the Government for undue delay, as I know every Minister's hands have been very full of late; but it would be desirable, before we commit ourselves to any important changes in the administration of the Public Service, to have some idea of the general scheme which, we may presume, has been outlined by the late Commissioner. Mr. McLachlan occupied the position of Commissioner since the first Public Service Act was framed. He was a very efficient officer and saw the Commonwealth Public Service grow to its present dimensions, and his reports have always given honorable senators and members of another place food for serious reflection. It may be assumed that his report takes a very broad and comprehensive outlook of the future development of the Service, and, therefore, it would assist us considerably if we had an opportunity of considering Mr. McLachlan's recommendations.

I am not averse to the constitution of a Board to act in the place of the Public Service Commissioner, though I do not know that the Minister gave any good reason why the office of Commissioner should be abolished. In other words, I do not think the demerits of the present system were pointed out by the Minister during his second-reading speech. Nor do I think that he indicated the superlative merits of control by a Board; but there seems to be a disposition on the part of the Government and honorable senators to accept the new proposal, and, personally, I know of no good reason why it should not. At all events, we shall not be making a leap in the dark, because I think the Public Service, in more than one of the States, is under the control of Boards, and I believe that the New Zealand Public Service is so controlled. Therefore the Board system is no new proposal, and perhaps, as the Commonwealth Public Service has grown considerably, there may be some advantage in placing it under the control of a Board of three.

But, like Senator Thomas, I would very much like to know whether the Board will have jurisdiction which the present Commissioner does not enjoy, and particularly in relation to such matters as suspension, dismissals, promotions, and transfers. These are all very important subjects upon which we should have some information before we commit ourselves to this important change. I do not know that I can add anything further. This measure is for one purpose only, but I hope the Minister will accept the suggestion made by Senator Thomas, and, before expecting honorable senators to pass this Bill, will make available to us Mr. McLachlan's report, so that we may have some indication of general Public Service legislation contemplated for the future.

Senator FAIRBAIRN (Victoria) [4.25]—I was very pleased to be present whilst Senator Thomas was speaking this afternoon, because I realized it is an advantage to have an opinion from one who has been behind the scenes. But I disagree with Senator Thomas' suggestion that business should not be originated in this Chamber.

Senator THOMAS.—I want to raise the dignity of the Senate.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—If we had not authority to originate Bills here, we would not have had many of the laws that are now on our statute-book. We have been referred to by the members of another place as the Minorcas, because we do not sit very often, and in pursuing that simile, it may be said that we do not produce many chickens. But the members of the other Chamber may be likened to broody hens, sitting on china eggs, which do not produce anything at all.

The PRESIDENT (Senator the Hon. T. Givens).—Order! The honorable senator must not cast any disparaging remarks on another place.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—I am sorry if I have transgressed. My remarks, of course, were only made in a jocular sense. In this Chamber, we have passed measures which, on being submitted to another place, have gone through without amendment.

I desire to congratulate the Government on having brought this measure forward, because we are all viewing with alarm the great increase in public expenditure which, at times, seems almost un-

controllable. I have already referred to the statement made by Mr. Storey to the effect that if the people of New South Wales do not work together, there will be a "Black Wednesday" before very long. By a Black Wednesday, I presume he means a crisis, and a possibility of the civil servants not being paid. I remember a "Black Thursday" in Victoria, which caused a great deal of distress, and I am sure we all earnestly hope that every effort will be made by those in authority to prevent anything of the kind again occurring.

The Government are to be commended for giving effect to some extent to the report of the Economies Commission. During the election campaign, it was promised that the recommendations of that Commission would be adopted, and that a Board would be appointed to control the Civil Service, with powers similar to those which are now provided, but which need amplification. It is very desirable to have an outside Board in control of the Civil Service, as the great difficulty in the past appears to have been that no one was responsible for seeing that the work undertaken was efficiently and economically conducted. It was admitted in evidence before the Economies Commission that the Public Service Commissioner did not consider that he was in charge of the Departments, and that he did not regard himself as a person exercising control over any particular Department. He was asked if the heads of the Departments were responsible for the economical working of their Departments, and he replied that they were chiefly occupied in seeing members of Parliament. Ministers have admitted that they have not the time to look into the details of their Departments, and to see whether they are efficiently managed or not. The Bill is, therefore, the outcome of the recommendations of the Economies Commission, which suggested that a Board should be appointed to see that the work was done on business lines. Senator Keating has said that the Public Service Commissioner has done very well, and he has up to a point. I think it was his duty to examine applicants for positions, and make recommendations; and, so far as I have been able to judge, he was an excellent man for the position.

When I was a member of the State Parliament, I was scandalized because of the extraordinary conditions existing in

the Lands Office, where practically every officer had a room to himself. The building was a three-storied one, and if an officer on the ground floor required information from one on the top floor, he had, until quite recently, to walk upstairs to obtain what he required, thus involving much loss of time. In our large banking institutions and merchants' offices, the work is all undertaken in one large hall, and with the exception of heads of Departments, the officers are in close touch with one another. Some similar arrangement should be made in connexion with our big Departments, as there are too many rooms.

Senator PEARCE.—That was the old idea.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—The system now adopted should be changed. I was glad to see that, when the Minister for Repatriation (Senator Millen) authorized the construction of the Repatriation offices at Jolimont, he adopted an improved system.

We require in the Public Service a Board comprised of business men, familiar with modern developments, and the Bill contemplates the appointment of a Board of Management, and sets out the powers to be conferred on it. We understand that three men are to be appointed for varying terms, but, up to the present, we know nothing of the *personnel*. Clauses 5 and 6 seem to contemplate the appointment of an officer from the Service itself. Honorable senators have today been supplied with a memorandum from the various bodies constituting the Civil Service, setting out that, in their opinion, the third member of the Board—who is to serve for a term of three years—should be an officer nominated by the Civil Service. This is following out the procedure which has been followed in many parts of the world, and also the recommendations of the Whitley Commission, and I earnestly suggest that the Government take this suggestion into consideration. The Public Service could nominate three men and the Minister could then select one from the three names submitted; but I would not like to see it made compulsory, because I do not know whether the system is one that would be beneficial.

Senator PEARCE.—Does the honorable senator suggest that there should be one

representative for the Clerical, Professional, and General Divisions?

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—Yes. I have not gone into the details, but I think that the request of the Service might be met by the Government.

Senator PEARCE.—Would such a man be responsible to the Public Service Association or to Parliament?

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—He would be selected by the Government, and, therefore, responsible to Parliament. The Government would have power to dismiss him if they thought fit. My suggestion is that the person so appointed should hold office for only three years, as by that time we would be in a position to see whether the proposition was satisfactory or not.

Senator LYNCH.—It sounds rather like a Soviet practice.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—I am not a Soviet by any means, but I think there is a good deal in the suggestion. The principle has been recommended by the Whitley Commission, and is being adopted in Great Britain, New Zealand, and in other parts of the world.

Senator PEARCE.—Has the honorable senator checked that statement?

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—No. But I hope the Minister for Defence will obtain further information on that point. I do not want to see such a provision incorporated in the Bill, because it is somewhat of an experiment. Perhaps the Minister for Defence will be prepared to look into the matter, and, if he cannot give good reasons to the contrary, will agree to appoint the third member in the way I have suggested. I understand that the members of the Board are to be appointed for three, four, and five years, to insure continuity of policy, and the appointment of a representative of the Service for a period of three years is, perhaps, an experiment worth trying.

Senator THOMAS.—The Board is to consist of only three members—two business men and another.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—Yes.

Senator THOMAS.—There would be no one on the Board to look after the Departments.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—One could be nominated by the Civil Service and the other two by the Government. It is

understood that two business men are to be appointed, but not necessarily from public Departments, although I suppose the Government have some good business men in their employ.

I have not given great consideration to the question of the Civil Service, because it is a tremendous problem, and would take one's whole time to investigate it thoroughly. If we are to avoid industrial unrest, we must be progressive, and, as the recommendations of the Whitley Commission have been adopted in England with much *éclat*, we should be prepared to test the system here. We must have industrial rest, and we cannot expect to achieve success in that direction unless we are prepared to move forward. I feel very strongly on the point of the third member being selected by the Service, and I trust the Government will give the matter their close attention.

I entirely agree with what Senator Thomas has said as to defining the powers of the Board. He pointed out very clearly that the gentleman now controlling the Commonwealth Bank would not take such a position unless his powers were defined. The powers of the proposed Board are clearly set out in clause 11 of the Bill. I was very surprised to learn, from the remarks of Senator Thomas, of the difficulty that is at present experienced in dismissing an incompetent officer from our Public Service. It seems to me that the very foundations of the Service are destroyed if an officer cannot be dismissed, either by the Minister or some other responsible authority. I quite agree with the honorable senator that we must jealously guard the rights and privileges of our public servants; but when an Appeal Board, composed exclusively of members of the Service, condones such grave offences as theft, we must realize how utterly impossible it is to countenance its continuance. Unquestionably, that is the reason why many inefficient are retained in the Service.

Senator LYNCH.—It is not fair to the honest man.

Senator THOMAS.—Nor to the efficient man.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—That is so. If we desire that men shall be appointed to the proposed Board who will really do good work, we must clearly define their powers. I notice that the Bill provides that "if the services of any officer in

excess in any Department are not likely to be required in any other Department, the Governor-General may call upon the officer to retire from the Public Service, and the officer shall retire accordingly."

Senator SENIOR.—That power is conferred under the existing Act.

Senator THOMAS.—And it does not relate to inefficiency.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—No, it deals with the cases of superfluous officers. If times get very bad, and Departments have to be reduced, that provision will enable them to be reduced.

Senator FOSTER.—Under the principal Act, is it not necessary to abolish an office, before the officer filling it can be dismissed?

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—Yes. I would like to see the power to which I have referred vested in the proposed Board instead of in the Governor-General. Indeed, I think that the Board should consist of two business men and one representative of the Public Service, in order that the rights of our public servants should be adequately safeguarded. Most certainly, the Board should be clothed with the power to dismiss any officer who is inefficient. In the absence of such a power, we shall never get efficiency.

I am not quite clear whether it is the intention of the Government to abolish the office of Public Service Commissioner.

Senator PEARCE.—Yes. The Board will take the place of the Public Service Commissioner. Wherever the Commissioner is mentioned in the principal Act, the reference is to be read as meaning the "Board of Management."

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—Then there will be no room for the Public Service Commissioner under this Bill.

Senator THOMAS.—The members of the Board will really be Public Service Commissioners.

Senator FAIRBAIRN.—Yes. Obviously, the success or otherwise of the scheme will depend upon the *personnel* of the Board. If that body consists of two business men and of a third member who is elected by the Public Service, we shall give the recommendation of the Whitley Commission a really good trial. The Board will be able to introduce into our Departments modern ideas in regard to administration.

I agree with Senator Thomas that the appointment of our public servants

should, as far as possible, be of a permanent character. Temporary appointments are responsible for a good deal of the discontent which exists at the present time. A man is appointed for six months, at the end of which period he has to retire to make room for somebody else. The Labour party was responsible for the introduction of that provision some years ago, but now I understand that its members desire to see it abolished. I repeat that temporary employees constitute a disturbing element throughout the Commonwealth Service. I hope that the proposed Board will assure permanent employment to the officers actually required, and that it will be able to substantially reduce the number of temporary employees.

Senator FOLL. — Many temporary employees eventually become permanent officers.

Senator FAIRBAIRN. — A number of them do; but the regular permanent officers have had to undergo examination, and in order to get into the Public Service a man has to enter it at about eighteen years of age.

Senator THOMAS. — It depends entirely upon the Division which he joins. That is the age for admission to the Clerical Division, but not necessarily to the General Division.

Senator FAIRBAIRN. — I am not aware that a great number of temporary hands eventually secure permanent appointments. When we come to examine the Budget which will shortly be presented, we shall doubtless find that hundreds and thousands of men have been appointed, year after year, merely for a tenure of six months. If their services are absolutely required, why not appoint them to permanent positions? If our Public Service were conducted upon lines similar to those which obtain in ordinary businesses, it would be found that a great many men, who could find a better outlet for their energies in other avocations, could be dispensed with. Instead of occupying a precarious position, and being at the beck and call of successive Governments, they would be able to find regular employment, and thus be substantially better off. Under existing conditions, we cannot have a contented Public Service. I hope that we shall introduce a few amendments in the Bill with a view to making it more effective, particularly in the direction I have indi-

cated. I trust that the proposed Board will be constituted on the lines I have laid down, and that it will consist of two business men of proved capacity, and one representative of the Public Service. This Board must be clothed with the power of dismissing incompetent officers, otherwise we shall never get good results.

Senator PAYNE (Tasmania) [5.0]. — After perusing this Bill which was so ably introduced by the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) I have arrived at the conclusion that the object of its submission is to enable Parliament to determine whether the time has not arrived when a change should be made in the control of our Public Service. The language used by the Minister in moving the second reading of the measure caused me to look very carefully into the interim report of the Economies Commission with the result that I have been impelled to conclude that there is ample justification for its introduction. The Minister stated that—

The Acting Public Service Commissioner had intimated that he did not consider it part of his duty to keep a check upon the economical or efficient working of Departments.

I maintain that in view of the very heavy obligations with which Australia is confronted, and of the wonderful expansion of our Public Service, it is high time that every effort was made to secure not only the most efficient, but the most economical service. Notwithstanding all the protestations on the part of Commonwealth and State Governments regarding the need for economy, one cannot fail to notice that during the past few years economy in connexion with our Government Departments has not been the order of the day. I welcome a measure of this description, which has for its object the bringing about of a better order of things in our Public Service. I listened very carefully to the speeches which have been delivered this afternoon, and I agree with many of the statements contained therein. I recognise that in the best interests of Australia it is essential that we should have a contented Public Service. If we desire to secure efficient officers we must see that they are assured continuity of service under reasonably favorable terms. But at the same time there has been brought under my notice during the past few years the necessity not only for securing con-

tinuity of service to efficient officers, but also of insuring to the taxpayers that where efficient service is not rendered, such service shall cease. Under existing legislation we have not been able to achieve that result. Senator Fairbairn stated that in his opinion any officer who is not rendering efficient service for the money he is receiving should be obliged to retire. The principal Act contains no provision of that character, but there is a clause in this Bill which sets out that where a Department is overmanned any officer in excess of the number required, may be transferred to another Department, and if there be no other Department requiring his service, such officer may be called upon to resign. That, I think, is a very good provision, and I certainly approve of the suggestion which has been made that the Public Service of the Commonwealth should be accorded some representation on the proposed Board. That appears to be only a reasonable thing. The suggestion put forward by Senator Fairbairn that the Public Service should have the right to nominate three of their number, of whom one should be selected to sit with the other two members of the Board, is an admirable one.

Upon page 85 of the report of the Economics Commission reference is made to some very important matters. Amongst other things I find the following statement—

8. It is somewhat of an anomaly that no authority independent of the Departments concerned has been set up for the purpose of seeing that satisfactory value is obtained for the amounts paid. There is no effective check upon Departments to see that staff is not employed except when really necessary, and, when appointed, is fully employed on useful work, and that material and other property purchased is actually required, and that good value is obtained for the money spent.

Provided that the report of the Commission is based upon reasonable evidence I submit that that paragraph, in itself, is a sufficient justification for the introduction of this Bill.

I do not desire to speak at further length on this Bill, as I understand that the main measure dealing with the Public Service has yet to be introduced. It has been suggested that the final consideration of this Bill should be delayed until the main measure is in our hands. I think that is a reasonable suggestion, because the two measures are so wrapped up one with the other that

they ought to be considered together. The principle of this Bill, which is the appointment of a Board of Management to take the place of the present Public Service Commissioner, has my hearty support. If we can secure the right men to form the proposed Board and to supervise the ramifications of our extensive Public Service we shall serve the interests of the taxpayers of the Commonwealth.

I express the hope that when the Bill gets into Committee some amendments will be accepted to make it more effective. I may refer to one amendment which, in my opinion, is essential. The Bill provides that if the permanent head of a Department does not approve of or adopt a recommendation, report, or suggestion of the Board he shall within a reasonable time inform the Board of his reasons therefor, and the measure then goes on to provide that the Board may, "if it thinks fit," make the recommendation, report, or suggestion to the Minister administering the Department. My view of the matter is that the Minister should be kept informed of every recommendation made for the more efficient working of his Department, and it should be the duty of the Board of Management, if a recommendation by them is turned down by a head of a Department, to furnish the Minister with the reasons. We should not, I think, place in the hands of the Board the power to make recommendations, and at the same time make it optional with it to decide whether or not it shall report to the Minister recommendations turned down by the head of a Department.

Senator FOSTER.—If the Board must go to the Minister in such cases, how is it to be kept clear of political control?

Senator PAYNE.—I do not suggest that the members of the Board of Management should consult the Minister before deciding to make a recommendation, but I do say that if it is turned down by the head of a Department they should report the matter to the Minister.

Senator SENIOR.—They have to do that in their annual report to Parliament.

Senator PAYNE.—I cordially support the principle embodied in this measure, and I hope that the suggestion made by Senator Thomas to defer the final consideration of this Bill until we have an

opportunity of dealing with the main measure will be adopted.

Senator FOLL (Queensland) [5.9].—My remarks upon this Bill will be very brief. I approve of the suggestion made by Senator Thomas to defer its final consideration. I am not an ardent believer in the present management of the Public Service. Within the last few years, in connexion with the work of the Department so ably controlled by the Minister for Repatriation (Senator Millen), we

we have had a very good opportunity to form judgment as to the advantages of adopting a different method. None of the employees of that Department are under the existing Public Service Act. Only recently we passed a Bill amending the Repatriation Act and establishing a Commission to deal with that Department, only I venture to say that if that experiment as applied to the Repatriation Department is proved to be successful, it might not be an altogether undesirable thing to appoint a similar Board of Management to control each Government Department. As honorable senators generally appear to favour the proposed substitution of a Board of Management for the existing Public Service Commissioner, I shall not deal further with that aspect of the question beyond saying that the Repatriation Department is carried on in a business-like way, and has done such eminently satisfactory work in the last few years that its example might well be followed.

When the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) was moving the second reading of this Bill, I asked him how many of the members of the proposed Board of Management would be appointed by the employees of the Public Service. I think it is not unreasonable to ask that the employees of the Public Service should have the right to appoint one of the members of the Board. Times out of number it has been stressed by members of the present Government, and by many honorable senators, that the problem of industrial unrest in this country may be solved by giving the employees in any industry direct representation on the boards of directors of companies carrying on that industry. After all, the proposed Board of Management will be practically a board of directors of the Public Service, and I think it would be of advantage to

the Service generally if one of its members were appointed by the public servants.

If no other member of the Senate does so, I shall be prepared when the Bill is in Committee to move that no member of the proposed Board shall be a person who has previously been connected with the Public Service. I think that the three men appointed should be persons who have never during the course of their lives been associated with the red-tape methods existing in the Service.

I think I shall not be prophesying wrongly if I say that the Government have already in mind the persons to be appointed to two of the positions on the proposed Board of Management. I think I could mention the names of two persons whom the Government intend to appoint to these positions when this Bill becomes law.

Senator PEARCE.—The honorable senator knows more than I do.

Senator FOLL.—This is not the only occasion in connexion with which something similar might have been said. When several years ago we had under consideration a Bill proposing the establishment of a Bureau of Science and Industry, which was opposed by some members of the Senate, I remember that, while the measure was before Parliament, it was practically known who were to constitute the Bureau. I think I am not far wrong in prophesying that what happened in that case will happen in this case also.

Senator Thomas referred to the fact that there is a percentage—I believe a very small percentage—of inefficient in the Public Service. I venture to say that I am expressing the views of Commonwealth public servants generally when I assert that they are just as anxious that those inefficient should be cleared out as are the Government or the Public Service Commissioner. I feel sure that the members of the Public Service realize that it will be in their own interests, and in the interests of Australia generally, that the Commonwealth Public Service should be thoroughly efficient.

If the Government would adopt the suggestion that one at least of the members of the Board of Management should be appointed by the employees of the Public Service, and be a man outside the

Service, the result would be satisfactory. I had some small experience of the advantage of having upon a Board a representative appointed by the employees themselves. On many occasions I acted as secretary to a Railway Appeal Board in Queensland. That Board was constituted of a police magistrate, the head of the Department concerned, and a representative of the employees of that Department. I am able to say that, in connexion with all matters dealt with by that Board when I was present, the representative of the employees gave an unbiased decision. The practice of having upon an Appeal Board a representative of the employees gave very satisfactory results indeed in Queensland.

When the Bill gets into Committee I shall submit the amendments I have now indicated, because I believe that their adoption would be in the interests of the Public Service. If the Public Service of Australia is to be efficient, it must be a satisfied Service. A Public Service seething with discontent is not likely to be efficient. If we have on the Board of Management a man of the type I have suggested, who will be a direct representative of the employees of the Service, I am sure that will give satisfaction to the Service generally.

I notice that the salaries to be paid to the members of the Board of Management are not fixed by the Bill. I think that good salaries should be offered, to insure the appointment of the right class of men. I hope that the salaries will not be fixed by the Government, but by Parliament. I indorse the remarks of Senator Thomas as to the wisdom of deferring the consideration of this Bill. The Government will, I am sure, meet the wishes of many members of the Senate if they will agree to defer its consideration until the other measures dealing with the Public Service are before us.

• **Senator J. D. MILLEN** (Tasmania) [5.17].—I have listened this afternoon with a good deal of interest to speeches which have added to my fund of knowledge. Honorable senators have played a tune on the word "efficiency." Every honorable senator getting up to speak on the Bill has spoken about the efficiency of the Service. Efficiency in the Service is utterly impossible, in my opinion, under the conditions depicted

by Senator Thomas. I should like to know how any Commissioner proposes to get an index of efficiency unless he has under him a psychological laboratory and an efficiency engineer. I should be glad if it were possible for the Government to include in this measure provision for a psychological laboratory and an efficiency engineer. The tendency of these remarks appears to be to bring a smile to the faces of some honorable senators.

Senator SENIOR.—Especially the reference to the psychologist.

Senator J. D. MILLEN.—Probably the honorable senator is not acquainted with what has been done by psychological laboratories in Germany, America, and England. Honorable senators may not realize the results which may be secured by the efforts of an efficiency engineer such as Taylor, as they may not know what he achieved in connexion with some of the great organizations of America. If the efficiency which he produced could be added to our Public Service, it would materially improve the outlook of the units of that Service.

What is the position to-day? We have a man in the Launceston Post-office who has a record of twenty-two years' service, and is receiving £189 per annum. I say that there is something seriously wrong about that. Where a man receives such a salary, dissatisfaction is inherent in him, because he cannot live upon such an amount. How are we to remedy that state of things? It may be done by the application of psychology, a term which seems to amuse some honorable senators, but it is a very important thing. Consider its achievements in the realms of education, law and medicine.

When Rice went into the matter of the application of psychology to education, he altered the system of spelling, very much to the betterment of the children. Where memory work is taught by the direct method, their powers of memory are very much increased. Read in Van der Donck's *Application of Psychology to Law*, of a case in Belgium on 21st June, 1910. Three children were out playing. One child disappeared and the two other children came home. When those two were asked what

had become of their playmate, they said that at a certain period in the afternoon she had gone away. The Police Commissioner appeared to the children at three o'clock in the morning, asking for information, with the result that one child said that at the particular moment when the other child disappeared "there was a man there with a black beard who enticed her away." That created a situation which allowed a considerable amount of suspicion to be thrown on the parents of one of the children. An anonymous letter to the Law Department caused the arrest of the man, and it appeared that he was likely to be hanged on the child's evidence. As he was being taken to gaol he was nearly torn to pieces by an infuriated multitude. Van der Donck was employed by the defence to go into the question from the psychological point of view. This is how he proceeded: He took twenty-two children and asked them to tell him the colour of the beard of one of the teachers of the school, naming a certain teacher. Seventeen children said he had a black beard, two said they did not know, and the other answers are not indicated. As a matter of fact, the teacher had no beard at all. Another twenty children were taken, and the teacher said to them, "Do you remember at drill time that a certain man came to me and said something to me?" Seven said "Yes." The rest were undecided. The teacher then asked, "Do you not remember that Mr. So-and-So came and spoke to me?" Seventeen out of the twenty said "Yes." As a matter of fact no such incident happened. The application of psychology to that case conclusively showed that the child's mind had been acted upon, and that the man who had been arrested was liable to be hanged on illusory evidence. The Judge found that the original statement of the child made at four o'clock in the afternoon was correct, and the rest mere imagination. I could give similar instances in medicine.

Now let me deal with industry. Several psychological laboratories were erected in America for the purpose of finding out definitely the dexterity of the employees of some of the big corporations. A board somewhat similar to a cribbage board, but with considerably more holes, and not of the same pattern, was taken. At the end of the board is placed a box for matches without heads. The person

to be tested is told that at a given signal he is to pick up the matches and put them into the different holes. At another signal he was to stop. The result is that some of those tested could put in only ten matches, some fourteen, and some twenty. The conclusion drawn from this test was that those who could put in only ten would not be efficient under any scheme of work which required dexterity of fingers, that those who could put in fourteen would be only average, while those who could put in twenty were segregated from the others, because they would be extremely efficient. Another way of testing in a psychological laboratory is as follows: A board is provided with certain holes, and above each hole is a number. On the wall in front of the person tested is thrown a figure which is visible for two seconds. He then has to take a match and put it into the hole which the figure indicates. That is a test of both perception and dexterity. Surely that would be a most effective way of finding out whether a telephone operator was efficient or not.

Further, these laboratories deal with the questions of fatigue and motion study. Gilbreth was invited by a large corporation of softgoods people to find an efficient scheme for folding handkerchiefs. That does not seem very difficult, but his scheme, when put into operation, enabled the girls to multiply the number of handkerchiefs folded by three. Some people may object that that was speeding-up. I shall indicate later what my view of speeding-up is. Gilbreth worked in this way: He divided the hour into ten portions of six minutes each. For the first four portions he made the girl sit down at a table on a chair that brought her arms within easy contact with it. She was to remain seated there for twenty-four minutes, and to work for five minutes and rest one minute in each period. At the end of the twenty-four minutes she was to stand up for eighteen minutes and to work for five minutes and rest one during each six-minute period. For the next two periods she could either sit or stand, as she pleased, but she was to work five minutes and rest one. In the last period she was not to work at all, but to allow the muscles to be, as it were, regenerated after the fatigue. The result was that

three times as much work was accomplished than previously.

Let me give an example of Taylor's work. Taylorism has been given rather a bad name in Australia, but I have learned that Lenin has asked Taylor to go to Russia and inaugurate his schemes there. Taylor was consulted in regard to the Bethlehem Steel Works—a proposition which has to handle pig iron. The weight of the pig iron is about 95 lbs. After a considerable amount of work in a psychological laboratory, Taylor found that a man could only work efficiently 43 per cent. of his time, and must rest 57 per cent. He selected a man and ordered him to do exactly what the timekeeper instructed—"You are to work seven minutes and rest ten." The men up till then had been handling on an average 12½ tons per diem. After Taylor instituted his new scheme they did on an average 47½ tons per diem, although they were working only 43 per cent. of their time. That is efficiency. People in Australia say, and have said, "Yes, but all this is only done by speeding up." Let me indicate to the Senate what I consider to be speeding-up. I have here a paper on which is certain printed matter that I want copied. I am not capable of copying it myself. The man who can copy it for me can do so only in block type, and it will take him, say, six hours. If I say to him, "I will give you a bonus if you do it in five hours," then I am definitely and clearly speeding him up. But if I educate him to do this work for me in script, and he can do it in an hour, that is not speeding-up, but the application of psychology to industry.

Our Public Service absolutely requires the application of this system, and many of the corporations of Australia could well benefit by it also. When the American Federation of Labour met early last year, they said they believed that without the application of science to industry labour could not go beyond a certain point, but that, with it, they could look forward to a considerable addition to their present rate of wages. So far as the Public Service is concerned, there could be an index card showing each man's efficiency. I do not say that when you find a man's inefficiency is low for the work he is doing you should dismiss him. You will probably find that he is efficient in another branch. You should not confine

this system only to the employees at the bottom. It should be applied right up to the executive heads, in order to ascertain if they are giving the people efficient service. And you should see that those employed are well paid. I thoroughly believe that, if you adopted the card system and indexed every man after psychological observations and under efficiency engineers, you would be able to pick out 98 per cent. of the men and tell definitely and exactly what they could do, in what way they could benefit themselves, and in that way they could benefit the Service. Surely this would be a step in the right direction. If the great steel works of America, which employ considerably more men than our Public Service, can afford to adopt a scheme of this description, and if some of the great German corporations found it absolutely essential to take on something of the kind, Australia might well stand in and decide to try it in connexion with the Public Service of the Commonwealth. I want to see some method adopted whereby we can increase the comfort and better the conditions of living of the men in the Service. I want to see their citizenship raised to the highest possible limit, but not altogether at the expense of the taxpayer. If we can show that it is possible to produce certain results by adopting a system such as I have described, with efficiency engineers and the application of the results obtained in our psychological laboratories; if we can tell the people of Australia that by this means we can give them a much more efficient Service, which will go a long way towards doing away with the trouble and annoyance that sometimes exist between the Service and the public, surely we shall be conferring a benefit on the whole community. We have a great body of men to deal with, and we have been told by Senator Thomas that absolute inefficiency can exist in the Service without any power to cope with it. This shows that we are confronted by a most serious problem. If we appoint a Board of three, and they have no index to the efficiency of the employees in the Public Service, I cannot see how they can give the public efficiency except by guess-work. If we multiplied the members of the Board by twelve, we should be

no better off than under one Commissioner, unless the thing is worked on a scientific basis.

I compliment the Government on having brought forward this Bill. The Service is seething with discontent, and I believe that the measure is an attempt to move in the right direction. I sincerely trust that in Committee we shall be able to induce the Government to add a psychological laboratory to the existing equipment, and efficiency engineers to the staff, so that we may secure the most efficient Public Service possible.

Senator ELLIOTT (Victoria) [5.35].— I also congratulate the Government upon having introduced this measure in pursuance of their pledges, and I believe that the Government should endeavour to get the best possible men for the proposed Board of Management, irrespective of where they come from. If they are to be found in the Service, by all means let them be appointed. I disagree entirely with the suggestion that the Board should be constituted by election. The most important consideration is to get the very best men. I believe also that the fullest power should be given to the Board. Its members should not be hampered in any way in their administrative duties, and if for any reason the responsible Minister sets aside their recommendations, there should be an appeal to Parliament. Only in this way may we expect to bring about a rapid change from inefficiency, which is complained of, to efficiency. I also agree with the suggestion that authority to dismiss should be added to the other powers of the Board, whose hands should be strengthened to the uttermost in order to deal with any condition of inefficiency in the Service. With the main provisions of the Bill, I am absolutely in accord. I think Senator Fairbairn mentioned that associations formed within the Service should be on the lines of the Whitley Commission, and in regard to this matter, when the companion Bill is under consideration, I shall undoubtedly favour the inclusion of some provision whereby members of the different organizations—there may be dozens of them in the Commonwealth Public Service—may be associated with

the Arbitrator, but I shall absolutely oppose any suggestion to associate them with the Board of Management, whose duty it will be to see that the Service is carried on efficiently.

Senator FOSTER (Tasmania) [5.38].— I join with other honorable senators in expressing approval of the Bill, and particularly clause 11, which sets out in some detail the duties of the proposed Board. When one takes into consideration the fact that an educational test is required of candidates for the Public Service, one must give them credit for a certain amount of ability to start with, and so I think that some of the inefficiency that has been complained of may be due to the fact that certain officers of the Service have not been properly trained for the jobs which, later in life, they are required to undertake. We have also to remember that, owing to the environment and the circumscribed nature of the work, an officer of the Public Service is not able sometimes to qualify for other duties to the same extent as a man engaged in the outside business world. And so when we talk about giving the proposed Board power of dismissal, we should not forget that if there is inefficiency, the authorities are, to some extent, responsible, if they have not made available to these men the opportunity to become efficient for the positions they are called upon to occupy from time to time. Then, as to the constitution of the Board. I hope the Government will see that the men to be appointed are of a calibre similar to that of those associated with the Business Board in the Defence Department. The men required for these positions are not those who are looking for such a job, but men who will have to be chased and to whom a large salary must be offered. It is quite possible that men at the top of the tree, so far as their occupation in the Public Service is concerned, will be quite unsuitable for a position on the proposed Board. Recently in my own State a change was made from administration by a Public Service Board to administration by a Commissioner, and I know that one gentleman, highly qualified in the Service, had a chance for the position but declined to take it. When I mentioned the matter to him he said— "Well, it's this way. I have been brought up in the Service. I have

been in it, for twenty-five or more years, and if I were appointed Commissioner I should have to recommend a lower salary to certain men or else abolish their offices altogether, and they would then be pushed out of the Service. I have been in touch with these men for so many years that I could not do a thing like that. I will not apply for the position." To some extent the Public Service is a close corporation. At all events it is so far as the higher grades are concerned, and it would be extremely difficult for any man, appointed to the Board from the Public Service to do his duty properly, as he might have to "come down" on somebody who had been in the Service with him for many years. I am rather afraid, also, that the Board will have to work a good deal of overtime in the matter of reorganizing the Service without performing any of the additional duties to be imposed upon them. Some of the Departments could do with a Business Board to themselves, in order to shake them up. The Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) has told us that this proposed Board will have authority to go into the Defence Department. That is badly wanted, too.

Senator THOMAS.—But they have a Business Board already.

Senator FOSTER.—A Business Board was appointed, but I do not know whether it is operating to-day. I know that, during the war, a man in the Defence Department had seven different jobs to perform. He was getting £250 per year, and the Department did not treat him very well after the war. The work which he did in war time is now being done by several men who are costing this country £1,750 a year. I am not blaming the Minister, because he cannot be expected to know all the details of his Department, but I say, definitely, that we could well afford to have a Business Board attached to each of the big spending Departments of the Commonwealth. It remains to be seen whether the duties laid down will be within the power of the Board to be appointed. There are other matters to which I should like to refer, but I shall take an opportunity to deal with them in Committee.

Debate (on motion by Senator SENIOR) adjourned.

Senate adjourned at 5.46 p.m.

House of Representatives.

Wednesday, 28 July, 1920.

The CLERK reported the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the chair at 3.1 p.m., and read prayers.

MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

Mr. HUGHES.—I desire to make an announcement in regard to the changes made in the Ministry in consequence of the resignation of the Right Hon. W. A. Watt, who held the portfolio of Treasurer. His Excellency the Governor-General has been pleased to appoint the Right Hon. Sir Joseph Cook as Treasurer, and the Hon. W. H. Laird Smith as Minister for the Navy, and has appointed Mr. A. S. Rodgers as Honorary Minister.

SUSPENSION OF MEMBER.

Mr. FENTON.—I ask you a question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, concerning procedure. You will remember that, during the discussion of a certain motion last week, there were some heated interchanges between the Minister for the Navy (Sir Joseph Cook) and myself, and I, coming into conflict with the Chair, was named, and my suspension was moved by the Minister. I wish to know whether it is within your power, in such cases, if the Prime Minister is within the precincts, to call on him to take action?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—It is within the right of the Chair at any time to call on the Minister leading the House to give effect to its rules and orders.

COMMONWEALTH TRADING CONCERNS.

BALANCE-SHEETS.

Mr. BURCHELL (for Mr. GREGORY) asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

Will the Government instruct, so that a fair comparison may be made between Federal and private business concerns, that in the preparation and production of the balance-sheets of all Commonwealth trading concerns such enterprises shall be separately debited with—(a) State and Federal income taxes; (b) war-time profits tax; (c) rates; (d) insurance, depreciation, interest on capital and advances; (e) full proportion of departmental costs reasonably chargeable to such enterprises?

Mr. HUGHES.—The answer to the honorable member's question is as follows:—

It is not considered that debits for (a) State and Federal income taxes, and (b) war-time profits tax, are legitimate charges against cost of production in a private trading concern, and it is not proposed to inflate Government factory costs by the inclusion of any such charges. Under ordinary circumstances, charges on account of rates would be incorporated in the factories' accounts, but, as the Commonwealth is exempt from such charges, no amount can be included under this heading in the accounts of any factory. The amount, if included, would not materially affect the cost of production. Payment for water and sanitary services are are, however, paid in Government factories. As a matter of policy, the Commonwealth carries its own risk of loss through contingencies which, in private enterprises, are ordinarily covered by insurance. Should any such loss occur in the case of factories, the amount of the loss is borne by the factory concerned. As regards depreciation, interest on capital, and advances, all charges on these accounts are duly brought into factories' accounts. All charges which are definitely incurred on behalf of any factory, including cost of audit, are debited to the factory, but it is impracticable to assess, with any degree of accuracy, a charge on account of departmental costs. In any case, the amount would be so small that the effect on factories' costs would be negligible. It may be added that the form of balance-sheet in use in the Defence Department was designed by the Advisory Accountant to the Royal Commission on Naval and Defence Administration in consultation with the Treasury, and is considered to fully reveal the actual position of the respective factories.

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE.

COST.

Mr. FENTON (for Dr. MALONEY) asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

What is the total cost, including salaries, allowances, rents, passages, and all other expenses pertaining to and for the High Commissioner's office from the inauguration of the office up to the 30th June, 1920?

Mr. HUGHES.—I lay on the table a statement giving the information asked for by the honorable member, which is as follows:—

Salaries of Commissioner and Staff, £110,730; incidental expenditure (including cables, rent, upkeep, taxes, advertising, &c.), £279,318; total, £390,048. Cost of erection of Australia House (including purchase of site), £913,003; grand total, £1,303,051.

In connexion with the cost of the erection of Australia House, it may be mentioned that the claims of certain contractors to be indemnified for losses owing to war conditions are at pre-

sent under investigation. The claims in question are being made the subject of exhaustive inquiry by His Majesty's Commissioner of Works, London, and it has been decided to pay on the basis of actual proved cost.

It is estimated that the additional amount involved is about £60,000.

PORT ADELAIDE TELEPHONE APPLICATIONS.

Mr. MAKIN asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

1. Whether there are at present approximately sixty applications in the Port Adelaide district awaiting telephonic conveniences?

2. If so, what is the reason for the delay in affording such conveniences?

3. When is it anticipated that such applications will receive attention?

Mr. WISE.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows:—

1. Fifty-eight applicants in the Port Adelaide district are awaiting telephone service—eighteen on the Semaphore side of Port Adelaide and forty on the Alberton side.

2. The reason for delay in affording service is the shortage of cable due to the difficulty in obtaining funds and material.

3. A relief cable is now being put down on the Semaphore side which will afford service to the eighteen subscribers within a few weeks. No cable is available to provide service for the forty subscribers on the Alberton side, but action is being taken to obtain this cable, and service will be provided at the earliest possible moment.

WAR SERVICE HOMES.

MESSRS. KIRKPATRICK.

Mr. FENTON (for Dr. MALONEY) asked the Minister representing the Minister for Repatriation, *upon notice*—

What amount of money have the Messrs. Kirkpatrick, architects of the Commonwealth Bank, received for work done in connexion with War Service Homes?

Mr. POYNTON.—The Commissioner advises as follows:—

No amounts have been paid by the War Service Homes Commission. All claims are being submitted for the arbitrament of the Auditor-General.

WAR GRATUITY BONDS.

FORMS—LAND SETTLEMENT.

Mr. CAMERON asked the Treasurer, *upon notice*—

Whether the special forms of application mentioned by the Acting-Treasurer as in course

of preparation for paying gratuity bonds are yet available for returned soldier employees of the Commonwealth?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The forms for all Departments except Defence and Postmaster-General's are available. Forms for the two Departments mentioned are with the Printer, and will be available in a day or two.

Mr. CAMERON asked the Acting Treasurer, *upon notice*—

Whether any arrangement has been made with the State Governments whereby soldiers' gratuity bonds may be accepted by the State Lands Departments in payment for deposit or rent in connexion with land settlement?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Arrangements have been made with all the State Governments under which discharged soldiers may use their war gratuity bonds in repayment of any moneys due for soldier land settlement.

PACIFIC MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. BURCHELL (for Sir ROBERT BEST) asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

With reference to a question asked by the honorable member for Kooyong on the 31st March last, *Hansard*, page 1011, with reference to the Pacific mail contract, and the reply of the Postmaster-General that the matter comes within the province of the Prime Minister and was under his consideration, will the Prime Minister be good enough to state what has been the result of his consideration of the matter?

Mr. HUGHES.—It has been decided to enter into a new mail contract with Burns, Philp and Company for twelve months from the 1st August, 1920, for the carrying out of a three-weekly service to Papua, Rabaul, and the Solomon Islands, and a two-monthly service to Lord Howe Island, Norfolk Island, and the New Hebrides, for a total subsidy of £40,000 per annum. The company is to be allowed freedom to increase freights and fares subject to the Controller of Shipping being satisfied as to the reasonableness of any such increases, the present rates to be increased in the first instance by 20 per cent. The contract will provide for uniform rates of freights and fares to be charged in respect of each service, and provision will also be made with the view of preventing any discrimination or preference as to cargo space or otherwise.

RETURNED SAILORS AND SOLDIERS IMPERIAL LEAGUE.

CONTROL OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF SOLDIERS' TWEED.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—On Thursday, 8th July, a promise was given by the Assistant Minister for Defence to the honorable member for Hunter (Mr. Charlton) that inquiries would be made into certain allegations which had been made against the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League in New South Wales of discriminating against returned soldiers who are not members of the league in the distribution of civilian suiting made at the Government Woollen Mills, Geelong. I am now in a position to furnish the honorable member with the following information:—

The Inspector-General of Administration reports that an examination of the books and minutes of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League in New South Wales has been made, with the result that there is no foundation for the allegations. The same prices for the tweed have been charged to members and non-members. An audit of the books of the tweed department shows that in no case has there been an overcharge. The league receives 1s. 6d. per yard on its contract—of this, 1s. is retained by the head office to finance the tweed department, and the balance by the sub-branch, less freight on the cloth.

In connexion with the remarks of the honorable member for Darling (Mr. Blakeley) that "the Sydney section of the league carried a resolution some six weeks ago that it would not supply tweed to non-members of the organization," I might say that no foundation could be found to justify the statement. The minute-book of the league was examined from the 1st April to the 16th July last, and no record could be found of a resolution, such as alleged, having been passed.

PAPERS.

The following papers were presented:—

Public Service Administration—Report of Royal Commission.
Factories—Reports on—Clothing, Cordite (including Acetate of Lime), Harness, Saddlery, and Leather Accoutrements, Small Arms, Woollen Cloth.

Ordered to be printed.

Customs Act—Revocation of Proclamation relating to the Prohibition of the Exportation of Mares (dated 14th July, 1920).
Defence Act—Regulation—Statutory Rules 1920, No. 124.
Excise Act—Regulations Amended—Statutory Rules 1920, No. 121.

Iron and Steel Bounty Act—Regulations—
Statutory Rules 1920, No. 122.
War Service Homes Act—Land acquired
under, at—
Bexley, New South Wales.
Newcastle, New South Wales (two).

PEACE CONFERENCE REPORT.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tudor) has asked whether every honorable member of this House or the Senate can obtain copies of the volume containing the Treaty of Peace with *fac-similes* of the signatures of those who signed the document, and maps of the areas affected. I am informed by the Prime Minister that any member who has not obtained a copy of the volume referred to may procure one on application to the Prime Minister's Department.

DISSENT FROM Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER'S RULING.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—The honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) has given notice of his intention to move—

That Mr. Deputy Speaker's ruling—that a motion "That the question be now put," can be received before the question itself has been proposed or stated to the House by Mr. Deputy Speaker—be disagreed to.

But before the honorable member proceeds, I would like to make a few remarks so that my attitude may not be misunderstood. I need not repeat the ruling which I gave, and to which the honorable member takes objection. It is still my opinion that the framers of the standing order providing for the closure motion contemplated that the motion should be submitted to the House for decision immediately on being moved. Otherwise, at least two hours and ten minutes might be occupied by the mover and seconder of a motion before the closure motion could be submitted. However, it is only right to say that I find from the past records that the present Speaker (Sir Elliot Johnson), for whom I am acting in consequence of the very serious illness of his wife, has ruled that a closure motion cannot be put until the original question has first been stated from the Chair. My ruling, therefore, is in conflict with that of Mr. Speaker. The standing order reads as follows:—

After any question has been proposed, either in the House or in any Committee of the

whole, a motion may be made by any member rising in his place; and without notice; and whether any other member is addressing the Chair or not, "That the question be now put," and the motion shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate.

I have no wish to differ from a ruling given by Mr. Speaker, but with all due respect, I contend that the Chair never makes a proposition. It is the honorable member who makes the proposition. On the occasion on which the closure was moved, the honorable member for Dalley (Mr. Mahony) moved a motion, and then proceeded to speak to it. The usual statement from the Chair is, "That the question"—whatever it may be—"be considered by the House." Those who are of opinion that it should be passed are asked to vote "Yes," and those who are of the contrary opinion are asked to vote "No." I regret that I cannot withdraw the interpretation which I have given. With great respect, I have to differ from Mr. Speaker, and submit the matter to the decision of the House.

Mr. RYAN (West Sydney) [3.15].—
I move—

That Mr. Deputy Speaker's ruling—that a motion "That the question be now put" can be received before the question itself has been proposed or stated to the House by Mr. Deputy Speaker—be disagreed to.

I regret the circumstances which have led to the absence of Mr. Speaker (Sir Elliot Johnson) from his place this afternoon. It is somewhat of an anomaly that if my motion is agreed to it will uphold the ruling of Mr. Speaker, and if it is defeated, Mr. Speaker's ruling will be overruled by the House, and that of Mr. Deputy Speaker (Hon. J. M. Chanter) upheld. I hope that honorable members will approach the matter entirely free from any preconceived ideas upon it, because it is of great importance that the rights of honorable members to discuss questions within the Standing Orders should be preserved. The ruling given by Mr. Speaker is undoubtedly right, and I invite Mr. Deputy Speaker to compare the various standing orders bearing on the matter. Before the discussion is ended—it need not be long—I hope that Mr. Deputy Speaker will alter his opinion as to the time when a closure motion may be put. The standing order under which the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) moved "That the question be

now put," is on page 71 of the Standing Orders, and reads as follows:—

After any question has been proposed, either in the House or in any Committee of the whole, a motion may be made by any member rising in his place, and without notice, and whether any other member is addressing the Chair or not, "That the question be now put," and the motion shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate.

I invite attention to the first few words, "After any question has been proposed." Those words define the time when an honorable member may move "That the question be now put"; that is to say, when any question has been proposed. Mr. Deputy Speaker's ruling leads us to this peculiar position, that a motion, "That the question be now put," may be taken when there is actually no question before the House to be put. The language of the standing order is quite clear. It says, "After any question has been proposed." The matter to be decided by us now is, "When is a question proposed?" and "Who proposes a question?" The Chair is the only person who can propose a question. No honorable member can do so. I invite the attention of Mr. Deputy Speaker to the difference between a "motion" and a "question," and refer him to standing order 120, which provides—

When a motion has been made and seconded, a question thereupon shall be proposed to the House by Mr. Speaker.

The word "proposed" applies to the statement of the question to the House by the Chair, and not to the intention formed in the mind of an honorable member to move a particular motion. Comparison of the two standing orders shows that the question is proposed by the Chair, and in that regard the word "stated" is synonymous with "proposed." But the actual proposal comes when the motion has been moved and seconded according to standing order No. 120. A glance at these two standing orders furnishes ample evidence and, I am sure, also proof to any unbiased person that the ruling given on this matter on a former occasion by Mr. Speaker is right. I hope, therefore, that honorable members will hesitate, particularly in his absence, to overrule a ruling which is obviously right. There are many ways of meeting the suggestion which you make that, if

the motion may not be moved "That the question be now put," then there is no means—if the House be so minded—of preventing an honorable member from proceeding with his remarks. There is ample machinery provided in the Standing Orders. The Prime Minister may move, "That the honorable member be no longer heard," and, if a majority is of opinion that it has listened sufficiently long to the honorable member who is speaking it can vote him down. But your ruling leads to the extraordinary position that an honorable member speaking, and intimating that he intends to move something, may have that matter put to the House, although there is not another honorable member who is prepared to second it. A motion can not be put to the House unless some honorable member has seconded it. I hold that there is a difference between a proposed motion and a proposed question. You, sir, would elevate the position of a proposed motion to the same position as if it were a question to be decided by the House. If you confine yourself to the interpretation of the Standing Orders to which I have referred—and they are as plain as the English language can be—I submit that you will come to the conclusion that you committed an error in your ruling. But I refer you also to *May* (10th edition, pp. 265, 266) in order to point out what is meant by the word "proposed." *May* lays down that questions are proposed by Mr. Speaker—

In the Commons, when the motion has been seconded, it merges in the question, which is proposed by the Speaker to the House, and read by him; after which the House is in possession of the question.

And until the House is in possession of the question it is absurd to suggest that any honorable member may move "That the question be now put." Let me carry my argument a little further. *May* (page 276) also lays down when an amendment may be moved. This has a bearing and throws light upon the question—that is, if it is necessary to shed light upon the obvious. *May* says—

The time for moving an amendment is after a question has been proposed by the Speaker, and before it has been put.

So there is a difference between proposing a question and the putting of the question. But, before any honorable member can invoke the closure, there

must be the question proposed by the Chair; and the motion is then to bring it to a decision—which is the putting of the question. I would again refer you, sir, to *May* (page 213), where there is reference to the time of the closure—

A closure motion may therefore be sanctioned by the Chair, either immediately upon, or within a few minutes after, the proposal to the House of the question to be closed.

I ask honorable members to closely examine those words. Of course, I know, and no doubt you, sir, also know, as do honorable members generally, that the closure is moved very often in the middle of an honorable member's speech, and, perhaps, after he has indicated that he intends to move something. The closure in such cases is moved in order to prevent that honorable member from developing his intention into a question by having it put through the Chair. Some honorable member—generally a Minister—rises and moves "That the question be now put." Of course, the honorable member who was originally speaking is then prevented from having his intended motion developed into a question. But before that procedure can be adopted there must be some question before the Chair.

Mr. HUGHES.—There was a question before the Chair on this occasion, because the honorable member said "I move."

Mr. RYAN.—The fact that an honorable member gets up in this House and says "I move," does not make it a question, unless some other honorable member also gets up and says "I second it."

After all, sir, your ruling arises from a confusion and from a misunderstanding of the technical meaning of the word "proposed," as used in the Standing Orders. If you will read them carefully you will find that the word "proposed," used with regard to a question, is employed with regard to the stating of the question by Mr. Speaker.

We all know the special circumstances which gave rise to the ruling in question. The honorable member for Dalley (Mr. Mahony) was moving to postpone the Orders of the Day until after the consideration of notice of motion No. 1, Government business.

Mr. WATKINS.—Did the honorable member actually move it?

Mr. RYAN.—No; he indicated that he was going to move it. But, whether he

did actually move it or not does not affect my argument, because it only becomes a question when it has been seconded and is proposed from the Chair. The matter is one of great importance, and I hope honorable members will see the necessity for settling it irrespective of which side of the House they may be found, because we may sit on one side of this Chamber to-day and on the other side to-morrow. It is necessary that we should be able to uphold the rights of honorable members. The Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes), when he moved his motion, was out of order. Evidently he had become very anxious, for some reason or other, to prevent the honorable member for Dalley from proceeding with his very eloquent and forcefully impressive speech with respect to the War Precautions Act and industrial unrest. The Prime Minister used the first instrument at his hand when he rose and moved "That the question be now put." I submit that the House should not hesitate to disagree with your ruling; but I hope, rather, sir, that you will reconsider your decision and render one which will be in conformity with the decision of Mr. Speaker (Hon. Sir Elliot Johnson) on this matter, which is obviously right.

Mr. WEST (East Sydney) [3.30].—In seconding the motion, I desire to draw the attention of honorable members to the seriousness of the matter with which we are now dealing. The ruling given by Mr. Deputy Speaker restricts the rights of honorable members to address the House. The merits or demerits of the motion that was closed need not concern us; but it is necessary that honorable members should support this dissent lest the ruling to which exception is taken be made the means of preventing honorable members from bringing business before the House. I hold strongly the opinion that no question can be before the House until it has been stated from the Chair. Often members have risen with the intention of making a motion, but, during the course of their preliminary remarks, some development takes place which obviates the need for proceeding further, and the motion is not made. It is only when a question has been stated from the Chair, and has thus become the property of the House, that it may be closed. Honorable members who voted for the closure on Friday did so in ignorance of the motion

that they were closing. *May* makes it very clear that a question must be stated from the Chair before it is before the House; and if the House of Commons, or the House of Lords, insists upon that procedure, we cannot go far wrong in following their example. Mr. Speaker is not infallible; like all human beings he is liable to error. The Prime Minister is often in such a state of mind that he is not in a position to appreciate the seriousness of the things he does. That was the case on Friday, when he moved the closure, whilst Mr. Deputy Speaker, no doubt elated because of the responsible position he was filling, lost for the time being his customary level-headedness. Any encroachment on the rights and privileges of honorable members should be resisted. I do not say that some curtailment of debate is not wise, but when the closure is applied, its application should be in accordance with the Standing Orders. I hope honorable members will rise above party prejudices, and by their vote upon this interpretation of the Standing Orders preserve the rights and privileges of the House. Mr. Deputy Speaker delivered a hasty judgment which was fraught with great danger to this House. Therefore I hope honorable members will indorse the views enunciated by the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan).

Mr. BRENNAN.—I rise to a point of order. I was under the impression that when Mr. Speaker had definitely ruled upon any point, such as that now under consideration, his ruling became the settled procedure of the House until it was altered by a vote of the House, or until the Standing Orders had been amended. Do I gather that, although Mr. Speaker has given a definite ruling, it remains for any Deputy-Speaker to give any fantastic ruling he may please in absolute contradiction of the procedure laid down by Mr. Speaker? I am reminded by interjection that the late Sir Thomas Bent once gave a ruling to which he was careful to add, "That is my ruling for to-night, anyhow." I thought, perhaps, you, sir, meant that those words should be added to your ruling on Friday.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—The ruling of Mr. Speaker Johnson was given on another question,

and in accordance with his interpretation of the Standing Orders at that time. The House is now dealing with a motion to dissent from a ruling given by me, and I hold that it is within the power of the House to review at any time any interpretation of its rules. That being the case, this discussion is in order.

Mr. HUGHES (Bendigo—Prime Minister and Attorney-General) [3.39].—The honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) has based his argument on the first paragraph of the standing order dealing with the closure, and he has urged particularly that the word "proposed" in relation to any question means proposed from the Chair. He has quoted other Standing Orders in support of his contention, and has said very properly that we must discuss this question without reference to the side of the House upon which we sit. I agree with that entirely. I have sat on other sides of the House, and I am trying to deal with this question on its merits. The honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) has referred us to the Standing Orders themselves. I brush aside the question of whether Mr. Speaker's ruling is in accordance with the ruling of yourself, sir—I put that on one side, and for the very reason that the honorable member for West Sydney advanced, namely, that all men are liable to error. You, sir, on the face of things, are no more likely to be free from a liability to error than any other man; and, therefore, we come back to the question itself. We have to ask ourselves, as every Court does in construing an Act: What is the object of these Standing Orders—what did the Legislature intend in adopting them? Clearly, the object of this and the following Standing Orders is to prevent honorable members speaking at undue length, and to give the House control over its own business. It is provided that when any motion is moved any member may get up, although another honorable member is speaking, and move "That the question be now put," "That the honorable member be no further heard," and so on. There are two possible meanings to the word "proposed," and the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) has said that it means a proposal from the Chair only. Very well, let us see whether that meaning is compatible

with the object of the Standing Orders, which, as I say, is to give the House control over individual members and prevent them arresting the progress of business. If the honorable member's contention were correct, it would follow that an honorable member might speak for an hour and five minutes, and not until he had finished; and his seconder, with a like right, had spoken for another hour and five minutes, and the motion had been put from the Chair, would it be possible for any honorable member to move "That the question be now put." Further, when the question was put from the Chair, any honorable member might immediately move an amendment, on which he might speak for a like time, and when that amendment had been defeated, he might move a similar one; so it the proceedings might go on *ad infinitum*. It is quite clear that the whole object of these Standing Orders is to prevent waste of the time of the House. In the present case it is said that there was no motion before the Chair, but the honorable member for Dalley (Mr. Mahony), it will be remembered, moved that the Orders of the Day should be postponed until after the consideration of notice of motion No. 1, in the name of Mr. Groom. On this, the then Acting Treasurer (Sir Joseph Cook) said that he understood that the business of the day had been called on, and, therefore, the honorable member's motion was too late. But you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, then said that the particular Order of the Day appearing first on the paper had not been called on, and, therefore, the motion of the honorable member for Dalley was in order. Will the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan), in the face of these clear facts, say there was no motion before the Chair? It will be seen that the order that appeared first on the business paper had not been called on, and that, therefore, the motion of the honorable member for Dalley was in order; and that honorable member proceeded to discuss it at length. It was not until it was very obvious that the intention of the honorable member was to waste time that I got up and moved "That the question be now put."

Mr. MAHONY.—I object to the remark that my object was clearly to waste time. It was nothing of the sort, and I ask that the reflection on myself be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—Will the right honorable the Minister withdraw the remark?

Mr. HUGHES.—What have I said?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The honorable member for Dalley says that the Minister charges him with wasting time, and he objects. I ask the Minister to withdraw the remark.

Mr. HUGHES.—Of course, if the honorable member says that his object was not to waste time, I withdraw the remark; but honorable members generally know perfectly well that that was the intention of the honorable member and of every honorable member on that side, and I do not see why any one should take umbrage at a plain statement of fact. Let me remind honorable members what has been done in this House, not once, but hundreds of times. I refer to the *Hansard* report of the 18th November, 1913, page 3265, when the Government Preference Prohibition Bill was before the House.

Mr. TUDOR.—You were on this side then.

Mr. HUGHES.—I know I was; and I only desire to show what has been done here many times. There was a motion by Mr., now Sir William Irvine, that the Bill be read a third time. The question was not put from the Chair at all, but the honorable member for Kennedy (Mr. McDonald) rose to speak. He had not got further than "Mr. Speaker" when he was arrested by the then member for Wentworth (Mr. Kelly), who proposed "That the question be now put." Here we have three things one after the other—a motion by Sir William Irvine for the third reading of the Bill, an attempt by the honorable member for Kennedy to say something to the Chair, and a motion by the then honorable member for Wentworth "That the question be now put"; and the latter motion was forthwith put and carried. There were dozens and dozens of such cases at that time, as, apparently the usual way of carrying on the business. I take it as one of the most glowing tributes to my tolerance that I said very little at that particular time; indeed, I do not know what was the matter with me. I venture to say that there is nothing in the Standing Orders at all to support the contention of the honorable

member for West Sydney. There is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the very nature and object of the Standing Orders the support to which you must look for your ruling. The object of these Standing Orders is to prevent waste of time. If the ruling the honorable member for West Sydney would have you give is upheld, all I can say is that these Standing Orders are absolutely useless, for two hours and ten minutes could be taken up on any motion before it could be moved "That the question be now put." But as we have now each occupied about twenty minutes in discussing the matter, I move—

That the question be now put.

Question—That the question be now put—put. The House divided.

Ayes	30
Noes	19

Majority 11

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.	Lister, J. H.
Blundell, R. P.	Marks, W. M.
Bowden, E. K.	Marr, C. W. C.
Bruce, S. M.	McWilliams, W. J.
Cameron, D. C.	Page, Dr. Earle
Cook, Sir Joseph	Poynton, A.
Cook, Robert	Prowse, J. H.
Fleming, W. M.	Rodgers, A. S.
Foster, Richard	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Fowler, J. M.	Smith, Laird
Francis, F. H.	Stewart, P. G.
Gibson, W. G.	Wise, G. H.
Greene, W. M.	
Hill, W. C.	
Hughes, W. M.	
Jackson, D. S.	

Tellers:

Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

NOES.

Brennan, F.	McGrath, D. C.
Charlton, M.	Nicholls, S. R.
Considine, M. P.	Riley, E.
Cunningham, L. L.	Ryan, T. J.
Gabb, J. M.	Tudor, F. G.
Higgs, W. G.	Watkins, D.
Lazzarini, H. P.	West, J. E.
Makin, N. J. O.	
Maloney, Dr.	
McDonald, C.	

Tellers:

Fenton, J. E.
Mahony, W. G.

PAIRS.

Watt, W. A.	Anstey, F.
Atkinson, L.	Moloney, Parker
Bayley, J. G.	Mahon, H.
Corser, E. B. C.	Blakeley, A.
Mackay, G. H.	Catts, J. H.
Gregory, H.	Mathews, J.
Groom, L. E.	Lavelle, T. J.
Livingston, J.	Page, James

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That Mr. Deputy Speaker's ruling be disagreed to—put. The House divided.

Ayes	27
Noes	21

Majority 6

AYES.

Bowden, E. K.	McDonald, C.
Brennan, F.	McGrath, D. C.
Charlton, M.	McWilliams, W. J.
Considine, M. P.	Nicholls, S. R.
Cook, Robert	Page, Dr. Earle
Cunningham, L. L.	Prowse, J. H.
Fenton, J. E.	Riley, E.
Fowler, J. M.	Ryan, T. J.
Gabb, J. M.	Stewart, P. G.
Gibson, W. G.	Tudor, F. G.
Higgs, W. G.	West, J. E.
Hill, W. C.	
Lazzarini, H. P.	
Makin, N. J. O.	

Tellers:

Mahony, W. G.
Watkins, D.

NOES.

Bamford, F. W.	Lister, J. H.
Blundell, R. P.	Marks, W. M.
Bruce, S. M.	Marr, C. W. C.
Cameron, D. C.	Poynton, A.
Cook, Sir Joseph	Rodgers, A. S.
Fleming, W. M.	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Foster, Richard	Smith, Laird
Francis, F. H.	Wise, G. H.
Greene, W. M.	
Hughes, W. M.	
Jackson, D. S.	

Tellers:

Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

PAIRS.

Anstey, F.	Watt, W. A.
Moloney, Parker	Atkinson, L.
Mahon, H.	Bayley, J. G.
Blakeley, A.	Corser, E. B. C.
Catts, J. H.	Mackay, G. H.
Mathews, J.	Gregory, H.
Lavelle, T. J.	Groom, L. E.
Page, James	Livingston, J.
Maloney, Dr.	Best, Sir Robert

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY BILL.

In Committee (Consideration resumed from 23rd July, vide page 2993.):

Clause 2 (Parts).

Mr. FENTON (Maribyrnong) [4.6].—This is a Bill which is likely to lead to considerable expenditure at a time when every Treasurer in Australia is crying out about the shortage of money necessary for

carrying on the ordinary works of development; and if we agree to this clause, which contains the various parts into which the measure is divided, we practically assent to the whole of the principles of the Bill. Under Part III., which sets out the powers and functions of the Director, quite a number of sub-Departments may be established which will naturally lead to increased expenditure from which, in my opinion, very little benefit will accrue to the people of Australia, and which will simply mean the duplication of expenditure already undertaken by the States. Nothing can be done by the Commonwealth that is not already being carried out by the various States. If it be necessary to engage the services of an eminent scientific expert to carry on research work on lines not at present attempted by the States, surely the States and the Commonwealth can combine to secure his services without the creation of a new and totally unnecessary Department for the purpose. It may be claimed that the will of the Minister will find expression in any action taken by the Director of the Institute. While there may be an odd Minister here and there who is prepared to withstand his officers, and determine how the Department of which he is the nominal head shall be conducted, for the most part the heads of the Departments practically control their Ministers. In any case there are so many other tasks which the Minister for Trade and Customs (Mr. Greene) will have to undertake besides the administration of this measure that he will be able to pay very little attention to what the Director of the Institute will be doing, and, therefore, will simply initial the recommendations brought to him by the Director. In this way expenditure will heap up. No doubt, at first, on the Director's appointment, the Minister will lay down very emphatically the necessity for having the Institute run on economical lines. He will say, "We want efficiency and economy combined," and naturally the Director will assent to that proposition, but there will be a very different tale when he commences his operations, and very soon he will be saying to the Minister, "My recommendations must be carried into effect if I am to be held responsible for the proper administration of the Institute." If honorable members peruse the powers and functions of the Director as set out in detail in Part III., they will readily come to the conclusion that this

Mr. Fenton.

Institute will not only be a big Department in itself, but may comprise quite a number of sub-Departments which can only be carried on by considerable expenditure. We are asked to incur this expenditure at a time when we have many heavy financial responsibilities facing us. Honorable members ought to hesitate before they give the Government the power to establish new Departments. There is a sort of an apology in the Bill to the effect that in order to avoid overlapping with the States, everything to be done by this Institute must be carried out in co-operation with the State Institutes; but I have yet to learn of any man appointed to a new position who has not immediately set out to magnify it, and make it more and more expensive. I shall not have it said of me that I sought to prevent any man from coming to the Commonwealth who might, through being possessed of ability not possessed by any person here, be able to enlighten us on various matters and carry out work that would eventually prove beneficial to the people of Australia; but I hold that the Commonwealth's part in bringing out such an expert ought to be confined to providing his salary. He could easily carry on his work in connexion with universities, technical schools, and schools of mines in the various States. All the machinery and appliances necessary are available to enable him to commence his work. There is no need for the Commonwealth to establish a new Department for the purpose. I am not preaching economy for economy's sake. The cry of economy is a horse one can ride to death. To economy on some lines I am totally opposed. Here, however, we have the opportunity of preventing the establishment of an expensive Department; but, unfortunately, a majority of honorable members seem prepared to indorse this expenditure without regard to the limit to which it may go. I am not opposing the Bill for opposition's sake. In various forms this measure has been before us on several occasions, and I have always opposed it on the ground that it would lead to the duplication, and even triplication, of expenditure already undertaken by the States. Can we justify establishing a seventh Department to supplement six State Departments already doing the work it would undertake? To attempt

to do so in the face of the liabilities confronting us is next door to criminal. It will be useless when the Estimates come down from year to year for any honorable member then to say, "I did not think this Institute was going to cost this sum of money," and move for the reduction of the item as a protest against such expenditure. At the initial stage we ought to be able to nip it in the bud. Those honorable members who vote for the Bill must accept the responsibility of setting up a new Department, which, according to Part III., may possibly embrace at least seven sub-departments. I hope we shall be able to take a broad national view of the matter; and, in dealing with each clause, I trust honorable members will see just how far the States have gone in doing the work which the Commonwealth is now seeking to embark upon. We should allow the States to proceed on the lines they have already followed, while promising them every assistance; and, if that is done, I am sure it will lead to the gratification of the people as a whole.

DR. MALONEY (Melbourne) [4.19].— I regret the remarks of the honorable member for Maribyrnong (Mr. Fenton), though of course, in the initiation of a large and important institution there may be many matters worthy of criticism. It is true that the various States are conducting experiments on lines similar to those which will be undertaken by a Commonwealth Institute of Science and Industry, but we ought to remember the many schools of surgery and medicine which are operating in England. It is the rival investigations of the universities of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales which serve to stimulate those bodies to higher and greater efforts. Science must rule in this present day. The old time of bows, arrows, and spears has gone by the board, if I may use a war-time allusion. The machine gun would mow them down in thousands. In the old days grappling irons were used in the course of naval encounters. Only in comparatively recent years have boarding pikes been abolished in the British Navy. To-day it is not so much the rank and file of the men on our ships as the one controlling brain which counts. And so it is in the matter of scientific application to agriculture. Only the other day the Minister for Trade and Customs (Mr. Greene) informed me that

he would cable to England to ascertain particulars following on an intimation in the press that a new variety of wheat had been discovered which would give more than ninety bushels to the acre. We know how lucky a farmer feels to-day if he can average twenty-five bushels for three years. Would we not be a wealthy community if our farmers could secure a return of ninety bushels to the acre? The honorable member for New England (Mr. Hay), and the honorable member for Darling (Mr. Blakeley) delivered speeches on this subject which are well worthy of perusal if honorable members failed to hear them. Those honorable members spoke of the benefits accruing from experiments in the growth of wheat. Scientists to-day are hopeful of producing a variety which will contain elements such as to eliminate the need for eating meat. The time may come when we shall all be grain eaters, and will have forsaken the eating of flesh foods. How much would thickly populated Europe give to-day if it could only obtain additional territory equal to that in Australia which has been rendered useless by the prickly pear? Do what we will, that pest is extending, and only science can arrest its progress.

In inaugurating this important new organization we must closely watch expenditure. It is my intention to move, in respect of the salary to be paid the Director of the Institute, that it shall be not more than £1,000 per annum. I want to see established in Australia the principle that the salary paid to a member of Parliament shall be the highest paid to any head of a Department.

I intend to vote for this Bill. I hope and expect great results from it. The central body should be the Commonwealth Institute, linking up with State activities and utilizing them for particular experimental and investigation purposes within their own States. A central body established in Melbourne cannot as satisfactorily carry out investigations, for example, in the north of Queensland as could a body established in that State. But the Commonwealth Bureau should be the dominant authority, linking up each and all of the States. Moreover, the Government should have the power to put before the central body specific questions of policy. A sum of £5,000 has been spent upon rain stimulating experiments, which most

people laugh at. Before such an outlay was agreed upon the actual question itself should have been placed before some such scientific and expert authority as the Institute will become. This should have been done before Mr. Balsillie was permitted to fool away £5,000. Our manufacturers are suffering to-day from certain striking disabilities. They may not own the machines with which they are working, but are only permitted to rent them. The central authority should be asked some such questions as these:—"Are these patented machines necessary to carry on Australian industrial life? If so, what do you suggest to protect the manufacturer and the public from these trusts and combines which hold the patent rights and are thus prolific of trouble and expense to Australian industry?"

Sir ROBERT BEST (Kooyong) [4.29].—If any honorable member doubted which way he should vote upon this measure he should have been persuaded to vote in its favour as the outcome of the speech of the honorable member for Maribyrnong (Mr. Fenton). The honorable member furnished some of the most cogent reasons why the Bill, as introduced, should be passed. His great point was that the measure would bring about still further overlapping; he enumerated several instances where that occurs throughout the States to-day. He pointed to the fact that experts in several of the States are engaged in branches of research and are actually performing a similar class of work. That indicates a waste of energy and a serious amount of overlapping. The very object of the Bill is to prevent that. The Director is told by the Bill that he must co-operate with existing organizations throughout Australia, with a view to preventing unnecessary overlapping. There must be complete control in the matter of co-operation and co-ordination.

Mr. TUDOR.—The Commonwealth has complete control over quarantine, but after the States had agreed that the Commonwealth should be supreme they all broke away last year.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—That may have been so, but the point is not really cogent to my argument. The very essence of this measure is co-operation with respect to scientific research. The best results can be achieved only by co-operation. The Federal Institute, so far as possible, should

undertake general supervision and be in a position to direct and assist the several States along the lines in which their energies should be bent. If there is a supervising and co-ordinating authority, such as this measure proposes, there will be effective results.

The honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) referred to one point on which we disagree. It would be ringing the death knell of a scientific institution, such as is here proposed, if salaries were to be limited in the manner suggested by the honorable member. Such limitation would at once preclude all hope of our securing the best men.

Mr. GABB.—I call attention to the state of the House. [*Quorum formed.*]

Mr. GABB (Angas) [4.35].—I realize my responsibility in regard to this Bill, and I take this opportunity of saying that I shall oppose this and every other clause in it, not because I do not appreciate the value of scientific research, or that I do not know that if we have not an Institute of this kind we shall be out of step with other countries, but for two definite reasons. The first is that the House has been given no estimate of the cost of the proposed Department. According to the *Age*, the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) is supposed to have promised an amount of £500,000 for the fitting out of the Institute. The Minister in charge of the measure (Mr. Greene), stated last week that certain requests for money had been made, but had been refused by the Government because the creation of the Institute had not been sanctioned by Parliament. I am glad that the Minister took that stand, but it is clear that once Parliament has given its sanction to this scheme, many and large requests for money will be made. My second ground for objection is the danger of overlapping. If any assurance had been given to us that there would be no overlapping, the fears of many of us would be removed. But we find to-day that there is overlapping of State and Federal activities in regard to the collection of taxation, and I am certain that if a Federal Institute of Science and Industry is established, not one of the States will surrender its Scientific Department willingly and with the consent of those who are employed in it. The honorable member for Kooyong (Sir Robert Best) said that the

statement made by the honorable member for Maribyrnong (Mr. Fenton), that the different States were already doing this work, was a good argument for the establishment of a Federal Institute. I would agree with the honorable member for Kooyong if there were any guarantee that the whole of the work would be concentrated in the Commonwealth establishment. But the very wording of clause 10, which provides that the Director shall co-operate with the existing State organizations "as far as possible," is an admission of doubt that co-ordination will take place. I am well aware that the Commonwealth cannot make a mandatory provision that the States shall co-operate, but my little experience of Federal Departments convinces me that the establishment of this Institute will lead to a tremendous increase in expenditure, and I desire to save myself from the risk of future reproach by opposing the measure on the grounds that we have no estimate of the cost and no assurance, other than a pious resolution, that there will be no overlapping.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [4.42].—I stated on the motion for the second reading that the success of this Institute would depend largely, if not entirely, upon the type of man appointed as Director—whether he was a practical or theoretical man—and I advocated the extension of the existing laboratory rather than the setting up of an entirely new Institute. In the Government Service are two sorts of Departments—the collecting Departments, such as taxation and Customs, which are always very careful as to how money is spent, and other Departments, like Defence, Home and Territories, and the Navy, which justify their existence by the amount of money they expend. This Institute will come within the latter category. I quoted last week the letter of resignation of the chairman of the existing Bureau, Professor Orme Masson; I have not yet heard whether his resignation has been accepted or withdrawn. There is a very great obstacle to separating the Institute from political control, as Professor Masson advocates. There must be parliamentary control of this or any other Institute, so that there may be a check on its expenditure. Furthermore, there must be co-ordination with the activities of the States. It is within the recollection of honorable members that a conference of

State Ministers of Health and their officers with the Minister for Trade and Customs (Mr. Greene) was held in Melbourne in order to evolve a definite plan of action in connexion with the influenza epidemic; but as soon as the State Ministers returned to their own States they repudiated the agreement with the Commonwealth. We may pass pious resolutions and express in the Bill fervent hopes for co-ordination, but we shall never achieve it unless we are in the controlling position. Even then there must be a doubt as to whether the States would hand over to the Commonwealth the work they are now doing. The honorable member for Darling (Mr. Blakeley), in the course of an excellent speech on the second reading, pointed out the desirability of the proposed Institute dealing with the problem of venereal disease.

Mr. GREENE.—I think that matter comes under the control of the Health Departments.

Mr. TUDOR.—Yes, and each State Health Department will say that it has complete authority to deal with the problem.

Mr. GREENE.—I think there is some co-ordination in regard to that matter.

Mr. TUDOR.—Yes. A Cabinet of which I was a member placed on the Estimates a sum of £15,000 or £20,000 to be allocated amongst the States for expenditure on the eradication or limitation of venereal disease. To what extent such activities would come under the control of the Institute I do not know. There is room for an establishment such as is proposed, but unless we place in control of it a practical man, not a theorist—

Dr. EARLE PAGE.—He should be both.

Mr. GREENE.—He must have the theoretical knowledge and the practical experience.

Mr. FENTON.—Is it not possible to get such a man without establishing an institute of this kind?

Mr. TUDOR.—The honorable member for Kooyong (Sir Robert Best) mentioned the name of Mr. Percy Wilkinson, a man who has done excellent work for the Commonwealth during the last ten or twelve years, and who, if given the opportunity, could make a success of the Institute. At

the back of the Customs House in Melbourne the Commonwealth has the most up-to-date laboratory in Australia, and it is available at the present time for doing Commonwealth work. Honorable members who have not visited the establishment should do so. If any manufacturers desire that technical work should be carried out for them at the laboratory, they should pay for it. If the technical knowledge of our skilled officers, trained in our own Service, is placed at the disposal of manufacturers and others for their private profit, it should be paid for; and the fact that such knowledge is available should be made known throughout the length and breadth of the Commonwealth. When I was Minister for Trade and Customs, a gentleman came into my office one day with what appeared to be a 2-lb. jam tin, and asked that its contents might be analyzed. I pointed out to him that there were numbers of private analysts, but he said that there was only one man able to analyze this particular product, and that that man was in the service of the Commonwealth. He informed me that the tin contained ambergris, which had been collected on one of the Tasmanian islands, and that if it were as valuable as he thought it to be, it was worth about £11,000. I push the claims of no one person, but I do desire the claims of all to be considered, particularly those of our own servants. There are Commonwealth laboratories in every State, and these could be enlarged and their usefulness extended. I am very much afraid that if we create a completely new organization we shall have a Department that can only justify its existence by the amount of money it expends; and this would be a most undesirable result.

Mr. WEST (East Sydney) [4.52].—I offer no opposition to this measure; but, perhaps, I take a view of it different from that of the majority of honorable members. This Bill is introduced under peculiar circumstances, as an effort to honour a sort of promissory note which was given by the Prime Minister, amongst a lot of other similar documents, at the general election. I take it that the Bill will result in the establishment of a National Institute of Science and Industry, which may lead to a co-operation of the States and the abolition of the State institutions as we know them at present. There is no doubt that a central laboratory is required

to investigate and value our copper, iron, and other natural products with which Australia is bountifully supplied, but which are as yet little developed. I feel sure that the States, in view of their financial position, will have to curtail some of their activities, thus making way for central Commonwealth action. I regard an Institute of this kind as a national affair, and the creation of it ought to have the support of every honorable member. There have been objections raised on both sides on the score of the cost; but I submit that money spent in this way is very wisely spent, whether in the interests of the man on the land, on the mine-field, or in the manufactory; any efforts that result in ascertaining the true value of our natural wealth must prove of benefit to the country. The States hitherto have not assisted the Commonwealth in centralizing many activities; but the blame for this lies less with the State Governments than with the Commonwealth Government. For some years we have not had a Commonwealth Government with the courage to stand up against the States for the benefit of the people; indeed, the Commonwealth Governments have been like puppets in the hands of the States. From 1910 to 1913 the Labour Government of the Commonwealth had to face the opposition of the States to the founding of the Commonwealth Bank, the creation of the note issue, and other proposals. There has been no Commonwealth Government for some years capable of bringing pressure to bear on the States so as to lead to the creation of a National Institute of Science and Industry, and it is very much to be regretted that we should have proved so weak in this connexion. Day after day we have Bills of a similar character to this, all showing the lack of co-ordination and co-operation as between the States and the Commonwealth, and that lack must continue until the Government asserts itself; when it does do this I feel sure the people will approve. I offer no opposition to this Bill, which, in my opinion, will render it impossible for the States to decline to part with any of their existing powers on the ground that the Commonwealth has made no provision for exercising them in a national way. I am not troubling myself about the merits or demerits of this particular measure, because I am only too pleased to see one of

such a character before us, with an object so necessary and desirable.

Question—That the clause be agreed to—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes 32

Noes 15

Majority 17

AYES.

Best, Sir Robert
Blundell, R. P.
Bowden, E. K.
Bruce, S. M.
Cameron, D. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph
Cook, Robert
Foster, Richard
Fowler, J. M.
Greene, W. M.
Higgs, W. G.
Hill, W. C.
Hughes, W. M.
Jackson, D. S.
Jowett, E.
Lister, J. H.
Maloney, Dr.

Marks, W. M.
Marr, C. W. C.
McWilliams, W. J.
Page, Dr. Earle
Poynton, A.
Prowse, J. H.
Riley, E.
Rodgers, A. S.
Ryrie, Sir Granville
Smith, Laird
Stewart, P. G.
West, J. E.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

NOES.

Charlton, M.
Considine, M. P.
Cunningham, L. L.
Francis, F. H.
Gabb, J. M.
Lazzarini, H. P.
Makin, N. J. O.
McDonald, C.

McGrath, D. C.
Nicholls, S. R.
Ryan, T. J.
Tudor, F. G.
Watkins, D.

Tellers:

Fenton, J. E.
Mahony, W. G.

PAIRS.

Watt, W. A.
Atkinson, L.
Bayley, J. G.
Corser, E. B. C.
Mackay, G. H.
Gregory, H.
Groom, L. E.
Maxwell, G. A.

Anstey, F.
Moloney, Parker
Mahon, H.
Blakeley, A.
Catts, J. H.
Mathews, J.
Lavelle, T. J.
Page, James

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 3 (Definitions).

Question—That the clause be agreed to—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes 30

Noes 13

Majority 17

AYES.

Best, Sir Robert
Blundell, R. P.
Bowden, E. K.
Bruce, S. M.
Cameron, D. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph
Cook, Robert
Foster, Richard
Fowler, J. M.
Greene, W. M.
Higgs, W. G.
Hill, W. C.
Jackson, D. S.
Jowett, E.
Lister, J. H.
Maloney, Dr.

Marks, W. M.
Marr, C. W. C.
McWilliams, W. J.
Page, Dr. Earle
Poynton, A.
Prowse, J. H.
Riley, E.
Rodgers, A. S.
Ryrie, Sir Granville
Smith, Laird
Stewart, P. G.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

NOES.

Charlton, M.
Considine, M. P.
Cunningham, L. L.
Fenton, J. E.
Gabb, J. M.
Lazzarini, H. P.
Makin, N. J. O.

McDonald, C.
McGrath, D. C.
Ryan, T. J.
Tudor, F. G.

Tellers:

Mahony, W. G.
Watkins, D.

PAIRS.

Watt, W. A.
Atkinson, L.
Bayley, J. G.
Corser, E. B. C.
Mackay, G. H.
Gregory, H.
Groom, L. E.
Lamond, Hector
Bell, G. J.
Livingston, J.

Anstey, F.
Moloney, Parker
Mahon, H.
Blakeley, A.
Catts, J. H.
Mathews, J.
Lavelle, T. J.
Page, James
Brennan, F.
Nicholls, S. R.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 4—

(1) There shall be a Commonwealth Institute of Science and Industry, consisting of the Director, which shall be a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal and capable of suing and being sued. . . .

Mr. JOWETT (Grampians) [5.12].—
I move—

That after the word "Director," in sub-clause (1), the words "and also of six local councils, each council to be representative of each State," be inserted.

The object of the amendment is to insure that the Institute, when founded, shall obtain the hearty sympathy and co-operation of the best scientific minds and of the leaders of industry in its various forms throughout Australia, and to insure also that the State Governments shall co-operate with the Commonwealth Government to insure its success. Without this co-operation and enchainment of

sympathy, the Institute, if it does not become an absolute failure, will, I fear, fall very short of the desires of Parliament and of the requirements of the people. The issue raised by the amendment is fundamental. Should the clause be carried as it stands, and the amendment circulated by the Minister for the insertion of clause 4A be inserted, the Director, subject, of course, to the Minister, would be the sole repository of power and authority, and he would be chosen, not by representatives of the best scientific and industrial minds of Australia, but by the Commonwealth Government. I cast no reflection on the judgment of this Government or of the Minister, or on their capacity for choosing a Director, nor have I anything to say in disparagement of the qualifications of any gentleman who may be in the minds of Ministers or of honorable members as suitable for the position.

Dr. EARLE PAGE.—Would the councillors be paid?

Mr. JOWETT.—That is a comparatively minor matter, which need not be discussed at the present moment.

Dr. EARLE PAGE.—Would they be Government servants?

Mr. JOWETT.—Not unless they happened to be Government officials when chosen to act as councillors. In many cases, no doubt, they would be State officials; but they would be persons chosen or nominated for the position and would be thoroughly representative of the best scientific and industrial thought of the States.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Do you propose to make the councils part of the body corporate that it is proposed to establish?

Mr. JOWETT.—Yes; they would be an essential part of the Institute.

Mr. MARKS.—The honorable member's proposal would really take the place of clause 4B, which the Minister intends to move, but would be compulsory, while the Minister's is optional.

Mr. GREENE.—These local councils would be in addition to the Institute, and could not perform the work that it is desired to have done.

Mr. JOWETT.—If the Minister will permit me to unfold my views on the subject, he will, I think, recognise that that is not so. I have used the words "local councils" instead of "State councils"

to indicate that the councils will not be representative merely of the State Governments. What the Committee has to consider is whether it will adopt a course which will enlist the sympathy and support of the best scientific and industrial minds of each State, and so of the whole of Australia, or one which will, to some extent, discourage that sympathy and support. If a dictator be appointed under the name of director, who at his own sweet will and caprice may make appointments to the Advisory Council, or refrain from doing so, that is likely to discourage sympathy and support. During the war I had considerable experience of the workings of bodies constituted in various fashions, and I say unhesitatingly that a government-appointed dictator who could ignore or recognise the scientific opinion of Australia just as he thought fit would, to some extent, diminish the usefulness of the Institute. My proposal is to establish local councils representative of the best scientific opinion. The election or nomination of the Director should be made by delegates from the six local councils.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Would not the tendency of the councils be to oppose the work of the Institute?

Mr. JOWETT.—No: quite the opposite. My scheme makes full provision for the various State Departments to be represented on the local councils, and each local council will choose its best men to be its delegates to the Central Council. If the Minister wishes to obtain the warm-hearted and cordial support of the best minds in Australia from the very beginning, he will not do it by depriving them of all sense of responsibility.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—Would the members of the councils be paid?

Mr. JOWETT.—That is a matter of detail.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—No, it is important.

Mr. JOWETT.—If the honorable member thinks it important, I shall answer his question. In all probability, the members of the local councils will be connected with some university, or a Government Department, or with some Chamber of Mines, Chamber of Pastoralists, or Chamber of Manufactures, and will probably be already in receipt of a considerable income. It will not be necessary, therefore, to pay them high

salaries in connexion with their duties on these local councils. Possibly they could be remunerated as the members of the Advisory Council have been, with a fee for each sitting, and something to recoup them for out-of-pocket expenses. However, if men of such distinguished ability are given some measure of power and responsibility, I am sure they will be quite agreeable to do the work without pay. In any case, they will be quite satisfied with a guinea or two guineas for each sitting.

Mr. RYAN.—Does the honorable member suggest that the appointments shall be made by the States?

Mr. JOWETT.—That is a matter to which I have given the fullest consideration, and which I shall deal with later on. My amendment to this clause merely deals with the suggestion. I have other consequential amendments. We have not to interest these gentlemen in science; they will do all they possibly can to increase the cause of science and industry in Australia; but if we are desirous of getting the best out of them, we must handle them diplomatically. A man will not get the best out of his agent or representative by ignoring him every day.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—How many members will comprise the proposed Council?

Mr. JOWETT.—There would be a local council for each State, that is, six in all, and there may be any number on each local council.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—The proposal is utterly impracticable. The Institute is to be a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal.

Mr. RYAN.—That is to say, *mutatis mutandis*.

Mr. JOWETT.—Given ample notice, and my own time, I dare say I could carry on a conversation with the honorable member for West Sydney in the language he has used, but on the floor of this House, and within the limits of debate, it is impossible for me to do so.

Mr. RYAN.—I was merely agreeing with the point raised by the honorable member for Kooyong (Sir Robert Best).

Mr. JOWETT.—If my amendment be inconsistent with the language of the Bill, the measure can be altered to make it consistent. The honorable member for Kooyong proclaims himself as the most impracticable man in the world if he makes the suggestion that there is any-

thing impracticable in the proposition to have six local councils.

Mr. TUDOR.—It is fair to say that previous Government Bills contained provision for the appointment of State Advisory Councils.

Mr. GREENE.—Yes; but they did not propose to make the State Advisory Councils part of the Institute. In that respect, the honorable member's proposal is entirely novel.

Mr. JOWETT.—It may be novel. I am not prepared to follow slavishly word for word any proposal previously made. There are people in Australia who are quite as capable of constructing schemes that will work as there are in any other part of the world. I claim that my proposal is a better conception than that which was set forth in previous Bills. At any rate, it would be more workable, and more likely to achieve the result desired by the Minister and honorable members generally. The experience of the working of the Institute during the last few years has proved conclusively that the best scientific and industrial men of Australia have not been satisfied to remain mere dummies under a political Department. In fact, they have made their protests in the most effective way, almost all of them, by resigning.

Mr. GREENE.—Not most of them.

Mr. JOWETT.—A considerable number of them have resigned.

Mr. GREENE.—Out of the lot, there were only three effective resignations.

Mr. JOWETT.—I know that some resignations were reconsidered.

Mr. GREENE.—Less than half of them resigned in the first place.

Mr. JOWETT.—Perhaps not as a body, but from time to time a considerable number of very important members have resigned as a protest against being practically dummies under a political head.

Mr. FENTON.—The brains of the Council have thrown the scheme overboard.

Mr. JOWETT.—I am not prepared to cast reflections on those who have not resigned, but very important and highly distinguished members of the Council did resign, because they were not prepared to be dummies under a political head. If this Committee decides to obliterate all representation of the best scientific thought on the Institute, it will be establishing a bureaucracy and a dictatorship which, by some happy chance, may prove

effective, but which, in all probability, is not so likely to be so.

Mr. BOWDEN.—How can the Institute operate if there are to be six councils with all of their members scattered over the length and breadth of Australia?

Mr. JOWETT.—If there be one thing above all others required in connexion with the Institute it is that it shall not be centralized either in Melbourne or Canberra or anywhere else. Its members should be drawn from all over Australia. Their field of operations, in fact, should cover the whole of the States.

Mr. BOWDEN.—But what would happen when it became necessary to call the members of the Institute together in order to sign a contract, for example? Would all these various people require to travel from all over Australia to the central office?

Mr. JOWETT.—Certainly not. If the Director is to be given power to do and authorize certain things, as set forth in the Bill, may he not sign contracts? And if, under the Bill, he is to have such power, then, with my amendment embodied, he would still retain that power. If you desire that the Institute shall be a success, there must be some form of representation of the State Departments which to-day are carrying on somewhat similar investigations and experiments as the Institute will undertake; and, as far as possible, there should be on the Institute effective representation of each State. There is no effective representation proposed in the Bill. If a Director is to be appointed without the Government asking the advice or counsel of any one else, either individually or as a body, then power will be given to that Director to create his own advisory council. The members of these various State councils, when appointed, will be asked to render enthusiastic service and assistance; but they are to be given no share in the responsibility for the Institute, or in the initial important task of appointing its Director. They will find themselves at the sweet will of a dictator appointed by the Government. That is not the way to insure the interest and co-operation of Australian scientists. Local councils should be appointed, and these should have some say in the selection of a Director, seeing that that person

will be their guide and chief. There is in every State of Australia to-day a university, each, I understand, well equipped and possessing men of scientific knowledge and attainments.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Watkins).—Order! The honorable member's time has expired.

Sir ROBERT BEST (Kooyong) [5.43].—I interjected, when the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) was speaking, that his amendment was utterly impracticable. I propose to indicate why it is so. The honorable member has stated that the intention behind his amendment is that the Institute should consist, not only of a Director, but of certain local advisory councils from each State. The number of members to be appointed to each of these councils was not mentioned. They are, apparently, to be an indefinite number totalling, perhaps, from five to twenty persons in each locality. The Director, together with this indefinite number of members of State councils, is to form the Institute. This body, having been constituted, will find itself in such a position that the simplest contract cannot be entered into, nor the smallest job undertaken unless and until the whole of the members of the Institute have been called together. It would prove too unwieldy for proper executive work. The fact is that the Institute will be unable to act until its members have been called together to consider the points, great or small, which are at issue. Let us suppose that there are ten members of each council. The Institute, then, will comprise between sixty and seventy persons. All of these will have to be notified and their expenses paid to Melbourne, or to wherever they are to meet. In addition to the item of travelling expenses, the members of the Institute, I presume, will be entitled to fees amounting to £2 2s. or £3 3s. a day.

Mr. JOWETT.—That is not my intention.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—I want to tell the honorable member what his amendment means.

Mr. JOWETT.—Is it not possible to pass an Act which would enable the Institute to delegate necessary authority in small matters to the Director?

Sir ROBERT BEST.—The honorable member, then, wants to substitute one individual for a selected body of men. The Bill does that more effectively than his amendment. I call his attention to the phrase in the Bill, "which shall be a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal, and capable of suing and being sued."

Mr. JOWETT.—That phrase could be left out.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—It cannot, or certainly should not be left out. The scheme propounded by the amendment will not only prove utterly impracticable, but, at the same time, most expensive. If the duties and responsibilities of the Institute are to be delegated to the Director—

Mr. JOWETT.—No; only in respect of such matters as the signing of contracts and of other small considerations, which would not necessitate the calling together of the full membership of the Institute.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—It is not the signing of contracts that is so important as the matter of the Institute first deliberating on the question which involves the signing of a contract. I only mentioned contracts as a simple instance.

Mr. JOWETT.—The honorable member's objections are frivolous and technical, and could be overcome in redrafting the Bill.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—If the honorable member had any knowledge of kindred institutions he would not speak as he is doing. My objections are not frivolous, but are of absolute substance, and particularly so from a legal standpoint. All that the honorable member seeks to obtain could be secured by the proposal of the Minister (Mr. Greene). It is very desirable that there should be local councils, so that the Institute shall work in conjunction with them. The original Bill contained a proposal for the establishment of councils to consist of three members each; but these members were not to form the membership of the Bureau or Institute.

Mr. JOWETT.—They had no power, and, therefore, they resigned.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—I may be making a mistake, but I believe that suggestions of the kind now being propounded by the honorable member are identical with those which have been so favorably entertained by the professors themselves.

These latter gentlemen are naturally exasperated because the Government are determined upon the appointment of practical industrial scientists to the various positions. I have the highest personal regard for our University professors, for whose studies in the realms of pure science we should all be prepared to extend our appreciation.

Mr. RYAN.—What does the honorable member suggest that these professors want?

Sir ROBERT BEST.—They want, of course, to dominate the Institute.

Mr. TUDOR.—They want all their own way.

Mr. RYAN.—Does the honorable member for Kooyong (Sir Robert Best) say that that is what is underlying the amendment?

Sir ROBERT BEST.—I do not know at whose instance the honorable member proposed the amendment.

Mr. JOWETT.—At my own instance. I am not a tool to be put forward by other people.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—The honorable member's amendment is singularly in harmony with the aspirations of the University professors.

Mr. JOWETT.—I have some respect for them, anyhow.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—So have I, in their own sphere. At the same time, if we are to get solid practical work from the Institute, it must be constituted of practical industrial scientists, men with a knowledge of industry. The University professors have taken offence at the terms of this Bill, because it is not the class of measure that they contemplated. But I congratulate the Government on their determination that the Institute shall be constituted of practical men.

Mr. RYAN.—If there is any evidence that the professors wanted to get control of the Institute we should hear it.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—The local councils proposed by the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) would give control to the University professors. They dominate the existing Advisory Council, and the work performed by that body has not been completely satisfactory so far as practical results are concerned. No industries seem to have benefited largely by any advice offered by the council; work has been of a theoretical

rather than of a practical character. I have not a word to say against the professors in their own line of pure scientific research, but I say that their University qualifications do not necessarily make them capable of undertaking the work we hope to achieve under this Bill. Nothing I say must be regarded as any reflection upon them and their distinguished services at their several Universities. But an Institute such as is proposed must have help from every source, and its best energies must be applied in an industrial direction. Therefore the amendment, which aims at making the Institute more representative, is not only impracticable, but would be very expensive. The same results can be more effectively achieved by the constitution of local councils of an advisory character as have been suggested by the Minister.

Mr. GREENE (Richmond—Minister for Trade and Customs) [5.55].—I do not propose to touch upon the points so ably dealt with by the honorable member for Kooyong (Sir Robert Best) in regard to the impracticability of the scheme suggested by the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett). The honorable member has not sufficiently appreciated what would be the effect of incorporating in the body corporate with perpetual succession various bodies scattered all over Australia and comprising an indefinite number of men.

Mr. JOWETT.—The Bill which the Government introduced into the Senate made that proposal.

Mr. GREENE.—That Bill proposed to constitute an Institute from three directions, and then there were to be certain Advisory Councils in addition, but they were not to be part of the body corporate, which constituted the legal entity of the Institute.

Mr. RYAN.—That is what the honorable member for Grampians says was the defect of that Bill.

Mr. GREENE.—Exactly. The honorable member for Grampians admitted that this proposal to include the six Advisory Councils in the body corporate of the Institute itself was entirely novel.

Mr. JOWETT.—I was told so, and believed so until a few moments ago when I read the earlier Bill, which the Government introduced into the Senate.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—We might as well have a quorum. [*Quorum formed.*]

Mr. GREENE.—What I and the honorable member desire is to secure the co-operation of scientific men, both theoretical and practical, in carrying out the work which the Institute will have to perform. The whole question is how best to secure that co-operation without overloading the Institute with expenditure, and how to direct its energies into the channels in which they are most required. The experience of the Advisory Council to date has been this: Perhaps an engineering question was before the Council; it was a small body, and there was no engineering scientist on it. Or, the question may have been one of agricultural science, and there was no member of the Council particularly qualified to deal with it. The Council found that in dealing with specific problems it was necessary to call in those special scientists whose particular province it was to study that matter. The men who have been doing the real investigatory work of the Institute in many instances have not been the members of the Council. I do not care how representative the Council is made, science is so highly specialized that it is impossible to place on the Council all the men who may be required to deal with the scientific problems that will arise. I have given notice of an addition to clause 4 which will be moved as a new clause, and which will incorporate in the measure what was the definite intention of the Government as to the way in which the Institute should operate. The Institute will comprise a Bureau of Agriculture, a Bureau of Industry, and such other bureaux as the Governor-General determines from time to time. One of those other bureaux might be one to deal with forestry. Of course, it will be necessary to appoint a definite head to the Bureau of Agriculture and, similarly, to the Bureau of Industry. Then we shall provide that the Governor-General may appoint Advisory Boards to advise the Director in regard to the general business of the Institute. That, I take it, will mean a gathering of scientists drawn from many branches of science, and convened from time to time to consult with the Director as to the general scope of the work to be undertaken. Also, power is to be taken for the appointment of a Council in regard to any Bureau thereof.

In connexion with the Bureau of Agriculture, for instance, the Director carrying out the functions of the Institute, in co-operation with the States, would naturally call together on the Board, first and foremost, the scientists associated with the State Agricultural Departments. It does not necessarily mean that the Advisory Board will be confined to such heads of State Departments. There might be other eligible men occupying chairs of agriculture at the universities, or experts in veterinary science, who might be called in to form the nucleus of an Advisory Council. In that way we shall secure all the men required to constitute a scientific body capable of dealing with particular questions. What is the use of having an advisory council composed of engineers to deal with the question of agriculture? The scheme of the Government is to secure, by the appointment of advisory councils, the assistance and co-operation of the scientific men of Australia for dealing with the specific problems that the Institute will have to consider from time to time. I believe that that will not only secure the effective working of the Institute itself, but will prevent the tendency, which has been noticed up to the present, of distributing the energies of the Institute over a great number of subjects, some of which are, perhaps, more urgent than others.

Mr. GABB.—I again have to draw attention to the state of the House.—*[Quorum formed.]*

Mr. GREENE.—What we are proposing will do exactly what the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) desires. It will be the means of securing the co-operation of our scientific men, and it will do so in a way which will enable them to concentrate on the particular scientific problems with which they are intimate. It will not call together a body of scientists who may not be conversant with the branches with which their fellow-members are familiar; but it will bring together, in co-operation with the Government on each specific problem as it arises, the best men it is possible to obtain. I have discussed the Government's proposals with those interested, and I do not think we will have the slightest difficulty in securing, with the exception possibly of two or three men, the whole-hearted co-operation of the scientists of the Commonwealth. I

hope the honorable member for Grampians will not press his amendment.

Mr. BLUNDELL (Adelaide) [6.10].—I intend to support the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) in the amendment he has moved, because it is an effort to secure co-operation with the States. I admit that the amendment may be open to the charge that it gives the advisory councils a power which the Government may be justified in objecting to, on the ground that it might mean creating perpetual bodies. If that is the objection, it is one that can easily be overcome—

Mr. JOWETT.—That is not the proposal.

Mr. BLUNDELL.—I agree with the honorable member for Kooyong (Sir Robert Best) that the amendment will be the means of creating in each State a body with administrative powers.

Mr. GREENE.—If the honorable member does not propose to make them a part of the corporate body, the amendment of which I have given notice will do all that is needed.

Mr. BLUNDELL.—I do not think so. The amendment is doing the very thing that I object to, as it provides that the Institute shall comprise, for instance, a Bureau of Agriculture. Where is that to come from? Is it to be in Victoria, where there is already a Bureau of Agriculture? If we say we shall establish forthwith a Bureau of Agriculture, it means that we shall have in Victoria a second bureau, and that is a serious objection. We have to realize that, not only in this State, but in other States of the Commonwealth, bureaux of agriculture are already established, and are doing splendid work. Instead of having others we should use these institutions in conjunction with the activities of the Federal Government, which would be able to deal with more important questions that are not of State interest, but rather of Federal concern.

Mr. GREENE.—That is what is proposed.

Mr. BLUNDELL.—The Bill provides that bureaux of agriculture "shall" be established, but in another portion of the measure relating to co-operation, the word "may" is used where "shall" should be employed. We should not agree to the establishment of new Departments when effective work is already being accomplished in every State, but should use those agencies which are available.

Mr. MARKS.—It reads “shall when necessary.”

Mr. BLUNDELL.—If the Bureau of Agriculture is to be successful it is necessary that it shall co-operate with the State bureaux already established. It is for us to find some means of co-operation to prevent additional and unnecessary expense. When I was a Minister in South Australia it was the practice to co-operate with the Commonwealth Government under an arrangement whereby the State bureau was utilized. A member of the advisory council visited Melbourne from time to time to consult with the representatives of the Commonwealth.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—That was not statutory.

Mr. BLUNDELL.—No; but the Commonwealth should link up to the States without giving them statutory powers or creating new Departments. We should co-operate in such a manner that they will feel that they are part and parcel of the proposal. We all recognise the necessity for such an Institute; but we must also realize that it is undesirable, in view of our financial obligations, to establish costly Departments that will be antagonistic to those already in existence. This Government may be quite prepared to co-operate with the States; but we have to remember that we are not legislating for this year or next year, and that it is quite possible that a few years hence a Government may be in power that will be in favour of establishing their own Departments in all the States. At the present time, I believe, there are some honorable members who think that the Commonwealth should ignore the States altogether, and in dealing with legislation of this character we have to remember that its administration may be in the hands of men whose opinions may be totally opposed to ours. The new clause of which the Minister has given notice sets out the functions of the new Department, and the moment a Director realizes that he has the power to appoint he will do so.

Mr. FENTON.—He has power in other clauses.

Mr. BLUNDELL.—Yes; he has.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—Does not the Bill say he “may”?

Mr. BLUNDELL.—“May” is a very convenient word to have in a Bill; but when we mean real business the word “shall” is used. I intend to support the amendment of the honorable member for Grampians, although I think it goes too

far. I ask the Minister to postpone the consideration of this clause, as he will then have an opportunity of carefully considering the amendment. This is not a party question, but one on which every honorable member is anxious to do the right thing.

Mr. BRUCE (Flinders) [6.19].—The proposal before the Committee seems to be the antithesis of the proposal actually in the Bill. The honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) suggests that it is not very difficult to amend the clause, and that possibly the Minister for Trade and Customs may be prepared to do so. To me it seems absolutely impossible when one considers the nature of the amendment and the principle underlying it. The Bill provides for the appointment of a central body, which happens to be one individual, to control, direct, and organize scientific effort. The proposal of the honorable member for Grampians is that we shall not have a central body, but that the members of the controlling body shall be scattered over the whole Commonwealth. That is absolutely out of the question—

Mr. JOWETT.—The honorable member has totally misunderstood my proposal.

Mr. BRUCE.—I am sorry if I have done so. I have perused the amendment, and I have also listened to the honorable member's explanation, and I cannot see that it has any other meaning. I realize that the honorable member has been persistent throughout in suggesting that he is not creating an unwieldy body which would not easily be brought together and able to come to a decision; but I suggest he is totally wrong when he makes that statement.

Mr. JOWETT.—Possibly the honorable member did not hear all I said, and I was not able to say all I desired owing to interruptions.

Mr. BRUCE.—Evidently the honorable member desires to make his position clear; but up to the present he most distinctly has not done so. He has told us frankly that there are to be six State advisory bodies.

Mr. RYAN.—Do I understand the honorable member to suggest that the position is not clear?

Mr. BRUCE.—I think it is absolutely clear; but, apparently my reading of the position is not the reading of the proposer of the amendment. I understand there are to be six advisory committees or

councils, which, together with the Director, are to constitute a body corporate. These States are scattered far apart, and, no doubt, the individual members of the proposed body will live at long distances from one another. How such a body will be able to act with any celerity, or any definite purpose, is quite beyond me to understand. It seems to me an entirely wrong principle that is embodied in the amendment; and for that reason I shall most certainly vote against it. I suggest that the matter cannot be dealt with in the manner suggested by the amendment, which involves a re-casting of the principle of the Bill.

Mr. GREENE.—If the amendment is carried it will mean that the whole Bill will have to be re-cast.

Mr. BRUCE.—Absolutely—an entirely new principle is introduced.

Mr. RYAN.—That would be in conformity with the suggestion of the honorable member for Calare (Mr. Lavelle), to withdraw and re-cast the Bill.

Mr. BRUCE.—That possibly is so; but I was not accusing the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) of such subtlety in his tactics. He voted against the Bill; but up to the time he made his suggestion I was under the impression that his idea was to honestly try to improve it.

Mr. JOWETT.—I wish to make it a good Bill now.

Mr. BRUCE.—I think that out of his own mouth the honorable member has shown that his mind has not the subtle agility of the mind of another honorable member who has just interjected. The points that have been raised in the discussion certainly require a great deal of consideration; but, personally, I cannot see that we can possibly come into line under this amendment. It is essential and imperative, as pointed out, that we should have the co-operation of the best scientific minds in Australia, and also the co-operation of the States' various Departments. It is also a question for the consideration of the House whether one man should form this body corporate, or whether there should be more. In the original Bill the number was three; and the number is a matter for direct amendment. It seems to me, however, that whatever is done, we must have a central body of a limited number, and provide that the man or men selected shall command the respect of the community, par-

ticularly of the scientific section and the leaders of industry. If this body acts with reasonable tact we shall get far better results from an advisory council than we could get by creating a great unwieldy body which certainly, in my opinion, would not give that scientific investigation which is hoped for under this amendment.

Mr. JOWETT (Grampians) [6.26].—I consider the amendment a most important one, but I was not able to give fully the reasons in support of its adoption. There has been, in the course of the discussion, such gross misrepresentation of my intention that it is only right I should make some reply. In deference to my honorable friend, the honorable member for Fremantle (Mr. Burchell), I shall withdraw the word "misrepresentation" and substitute the word "misunderstanding." There is one point I wish to clear up. I was subject to most violent interjections, and told that my proposal is utterly impracticable.

Sir ROBERT BEST.—Hear, hear!

Mr. JOWETT.—I give my friends credit for being consistent, even when they are wrong, as I shall very soon show them to be. I regard my scheme as exceedingly practicable, and one very easily worked—a very much better scheme than that proposed by the Minister in charge of the Bill.

Mr. FENTON.—It is as clear as daylight that I cannot vote for it.

Mr. JOWETT.—That is the severest blow I have received in my life. When I resented the implication that my scheme is impracticable, I was told that it is not my scheme which is impracticable, but that the amendment as I proposed it would prove so. I then pointed out that I was not a drafter of Bills, and I bowed to the wisdom and experience of the honorable member for Kooyong (Sir Robert Best), the honorable member for Flinders (Mr. Bruce), and others, with whom in such a matter I would not dream of comparing myself. The honorable member for Kooyong, both by way of interjection and afterwards in his address, poured oceans of contempt on this idea of mine—this "novel" idea, as he described it—that an Institute could be formed and worked in such a fashion as I propose. That honorable member described the idea as absolutely impossible, and that

opinion has been repeated over and over again by both himself and the Minister. I was not then aware whether or not my idea was "novel," but I accepted the statement, and admitted that, under the circumstances, it might be exposed to such criticism.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 8 p.m.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [8.0].—Unfortunately, I was absent from the chamber when the Minister for Trade and Customs (Mr. Greene) replied to the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett), who seeks by his amendment to restore the Bill practically to the form in which it passed the other branch of the Legislature.

Mr. GREENE.—But not to exactly the same terms.

Mr. TUDOR.—That is so. But it must not be forgotten that when the measure was before the Senate it contained provision for the establishment of an advisory council in each State. Though the creation of the Institute of Science and Industry has never been definitely authorized, there has been established in each State at least one advisory council, and the honorable member for Grampians, I understand, wishes to restore that provision in this Bill.

Mr. JOWETT.—To some extent.

Mr. BOWDEN.—He desires to make the advisory councils a part of the Institute.

Mr. TUDOR.—I cannot agree with him. I should like to know why the Government have discarded the State advisory councils for which the Bill contained provision when it was before us upon two or three previous occasions.

Mr. GREENE.—The position, roughly, is that the work upon which these scientific men will be required to co-operate, boils down to specific subjects, and we believe that it is better to make provision in the Bill which will enable us to call upon them to co-operate in respect of particular problems than to establish a general council. But provision is made for the establishment of a general council in regard to the central area.

Mr. TUDOR.—I think that the view taken by the Government is the correct one, because only specialists and highly-trained men will undertake independent investigations, and these men may be hampered rather than helped by the creation of State advisory councils. In my judgment, the amendment of the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett)

is not calculated to assist the Institute, and I regret, therefore, that I shall be obliged to vote against it.

Mr. CONSIDINE (Barrier) [8.10].—I move—

That progress be reported.

I do so as a protest against the high-handed and arbitrary action of the Government in prohibiting the public from coming to this assembly this evening. The usual course has been departed from without any explanation being vouchsafed to honorable members. Here on top of the action of members of this Parliament in increasing their salaries by £400 a year, the citizens of Melbourne are denied their right to come here and listen to our deliberations.

The **TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Watkins).—Order! The honorable member cannot debate the question. He may submit the motion, but it must be put without discussion.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	15
Noes	28
Majority				13

AYES.

Brennan, F.	Maloney, Dr.
Charlton, M.	McGrath, D. C.
Considine, M. P.	Nicholls, S. R.
Cunningham, L. L.	Ryan, T. J.
Gabb, J. M.	Tudor, F. G.
Lazzarini, H. P.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mahony, W. G.	Fenton, J. E.
Makin, N. J. O.	Riley, E.

NOES.

Best, Sir Robert	Lister, J. H.
Bowden, E. K.	Marks, W. M.
Cameron, D. C.	Marr, C. W. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph	McWilliams, W. J.
Cook, Robert	Page, Dr. Earle
Foster, Richard	Poynton, A.
Fowler, J. M.	Prowse, J. H.
Francis, F. H.	Rodgers, A. S.
Gibson, W. G.	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Greene, W. M.	Smith, Laird
Higgs, W. G.	Wise, G. H.
Hill, W. C.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hughes, W. M.	Burchell, R. J.
Jackson, D. S.	Story, W. H.
Jowett, E.	

Question so resolved in the negative.

Motion negatived.

Mr. RYAN (West Sydney) [8.14].—I entered the chamber only a few moments ago, hoping to hear the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) continue the remarks which he was making

when the sitting was suspended. I understand, however, that because he was two or three minutes late we are to be prevented from hearing what I anticipate would have been a very effective reply to some of the criticisms which have been levelled against his amendment. I think that the Committee is willing to hear the honorable member, and I suggest that he be given permission to continue his remarks.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Watkins).—There is no precedent for allowing a member to continue a speech after another speaker has intervened.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Is there any precedent for carrying on here under police protection?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—The question is not in order. I cannot take it on myself to lay down a precedent contrary to the Standing Orders.

Mr. RYAN.—Is it possible for me to move an amendment on the amendment of the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) which would be of assistance to him?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member could move to add further words to the amendment.

Mr. RYAN.—Then I take pleasure in proposing that those further words be added in order to enable the honorable member for Grampians to continue his speech.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member for Grampians has already spoken twice.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—If he desires to speak again, I am sure the Committee will hear him.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—If it is the unanimous wish of the Committee that the honorable member be allowed to continue his speech, he may do so.

Mr. RILEY.—I think that the Deputy Leader of the Country party should have the right to speak again.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—I enter my protest against the honorable member or any other member continuing the business while the public are not allowed to come here.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Are you going to allow this sort of thing to go on all night, Mr. Temporary Chairman?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member is out of order. The honorable member for Grampians has been called on to speak.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—I object, and rise to a point of order. You did not put the question to the Committee. I object to the honorable member taking up the time of the Committee. There was no motion carried which would permit him to continue. I say again that it is a standing disgrace that men claiming to represent the people here should be carrying on business under police protection, while the public is prevented from coming here. It is a most outrageous thing; despicable and disgraceful!

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—The honorable member is out of order in referring to that matter.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I think he should withdraw those words.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—You are not the dictator of this establishment.

Mr. JOWETT (Grampians) [8.20].—I am deeply grateful to the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) for his suggestion that I should be allowed to continue my remarks, and thank members for the permission that they have given to me to speak for a few minutes longer. I must apologize for having been a few seconds late.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—A motion was not put to the Committee, and I object therefore to the honorable member addressing it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—There was no objection offered when I put it to the Committee that the honorable member should be allowed to speak again, and I therefore called upon him to do so.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—You did not put it to the Committee.

Mr. BRENNAN.—I rise to a question of privilege. I direct attention to the fact that the meeting of the Committee is taking place under circumstances quite unprecedented in the history of responsible government in this country. For the first time within my experience—

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I rise to order. I submit that the honorable member may not rise to a question of privilege when another member is speaking.

Mr. BRENNAN.—Is the Minister for the Navy in order in submitting a point of

order when I have risen on a question of privilege?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—Matters of privilege are for the House to decide. It is the Speaker who controls admission to the galleries.

Mr. BRENNAN.—Then, in order that this important matter may be brought under the notice of Mr. Speaker, I move—

That progress be reported.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—Under the standing order, a motion for the reporting of progress cannot be moved more than once within a quarter of an hour.

Motion (by Mr. CONSIDINE) negatived—

That the question be now put.

Mr. JOWETT.—I apologize to the Committee for being, perhaps, the innocent cause of all this trouble, and again express my deep gratitude to honorable members for the privilege of being allowed to make a few more remarks.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—You will get a lot of privilege to-night.

Mr. BRENNAN.—On a point of order—

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I move—

That the question be now put.

Mr. BRENNAN.—Can that be done when I am stating a point of order?

Mr. WISE.—Yes, the motion can be proposed at any time.

Question—That the question be now put—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	30
Noes	14

Majority	16
----------	-----	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Best, Sir Robert	Jowett, E.
Blundell, R. P.	Lister, J. H.
Bowden, E. K.	Marks, W. M.
Bruce, S. M.	Marr, C. W. C.
Cameron, D. C.	Page, Dr. Earle
Cook, Sir Joseph	Poynton, A.
Cook, Robert	Prowse, J. H.
Foster, Richard	Rodgers, A. S.
Fowler, J. M.	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Francis, F. H.	Smith, Laird
Gibson, W. G.	Stewart, P. G.
Greene, W. M.	Wise, G. H.
Higgs, W. G.	
Hill, W. C.	
Hughes, W. M.	
Jackson, D. S.	

Tellers:

Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

NOES.

Brennan, F.	McGrath, D. C.
Considine, M. P.	Riley, E.
Cunningham, L. L.	Ryan, T. J.
Fenton, J. E.	Tudor, F. G.
Gabb, J. M.	
Lazzarini, H. P.	
Makin, N. J. O.	
Maloney, Dr.	

Tellers:

Charlton, M.
Mahony, W. G.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the amendment (Mr. JOWETT'S) be agreed to—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	8
Noes	36

Majority	28
----------	-----	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Blundell, R. P.	Ryan, T. J.
Brennan, F.	
Considine, M. P.	
Cook, Robert	
Jowett, E.	

Tellers:

Cunningham, L. L.
McGrath, D. C.

NOES.

Best, Sir Robert	Makin, N. J. O.
Bowden, E. K.	Maloney, Dr.
Bruce, S. M.	Marks, W. M.
Cameron, D. C.	Marr, C. W. C.
Charlton, M.	Nicholls, S. R.
Cook, Sir Joseph	Page, Dr. Earle
Fenton, J. E.	Poynton, A.
Foster, Richard	Prowse, J. H.
Fowler, J. M.	Riley, E.
Francis, F. H.	Rodgers, A. S.
Gabb, J. M.	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Gibson, W. G.	Smith, Laird
Greene, W. M.	Stewart, P. G.
Higgs, W. G.	Tudor, F. G.
Hill, W. C.	Wise, G. H.
Hughes, W. M.	
Jackson, D. S.	
Lister, J. H.	
Mahony, W. G.	

Tellers:

Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BRENNAN.—Before the next question is put, I wish to raise a question of privilege.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—Order! I direct the attention of the honorable member to the fact that the closure having been moved and carried, nothing can be allowed to intervene until all the questions pending when it was moved have been decided.

Question—That the clause be agreed to—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	31
Noes	12

Majority	19
----------	-----	-----	-----	----

AYES.

Best, Sir Robert
Blundell, R. P.
Bowden, E. K.
Bruce, S. M.
Cameron, D. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph
Cook, Robert
Foster, Richard
Fowler, J. M.
Gibson, W. G.
Greene, W. M.
Higgs, W. G.
Hill, W. C.
Hughes, W. M.
Jackson, D. S.
Jowett, E.

Lister, J. H.
Maloney, Dr.
Marks, W. M.
Marr, C. W. C.
Page, Dr. Earle
Poynton, A.
Prowse, J. H.
Riley, E.
Rodgers, A. S.
Ryrie, Sir Granville
Smith, Laird
Stewart, P. G.
Wise, G. H.
Tellers:
Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

NOES.

Brennan, F.
Considine, M. P.
Fenton, J. E.
Gabb, J. M.
Lazzarini, H. P.
Mahony, W. G.
Makin, N. J. O.

McGrath, D. C.
Ryan, T. J.
Tudor, F. G.
Tellers:
Charlton, M.
Cunningham, L. L.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Clause agreed to.

MR. BRENNAN.—I rise to a point of order. I wanted to raise a question of privilege a while ago. On the matter of privilege and order I wish to direct attention to certain standing orders relating to the matter. Standing order 111 states—

An urgent motion, directly concerning the privileges of the House, shall take precedence of other motions, as well as of Orders of the Day.

Standing order 283 says—

Any member may rise to speak "to order," or upon a matter of privilege suddenly arising.

Standing order 284 provides—

All questions of order and matters of privilege at any time arising shall, until decided, suspend the consideration and decision of every other question.

There is no reference to the powers and duties of the Committee of the House, but I submit that the Committee is for the time being the guardian of the privileges of the House, and that a matter of privilege suddenly arising, as it has in this case, must be decided as the standing order provides in precedence of every other matter. A little while ago I rose to put this point, but before I was able to put it the Treasurer (Sir Joseph Cook), with characteristic discourtesy, plunged in and interrupted me. I ask the Temporary Chairman (Mr. Watkins) to take counsel with those who

may be presumed to know something about the matter, and without any disrespect I suggest that the point I raise is unanswerably in favour of my being able to bring forward any question of privilege, and submit it for the immediate decision of the Committee; because the matter to which I refer is very urgent, and because I think the Committee would be careful to be the guardian of its own rights and privileges. With the military and the secret service of the police surrounding us, I should say that the matter is an urgent one, if ever there was such a thing, requiring immediate decision.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Watkins).—The standing order dealing with the moving of the closure distinctly lays down the following—

After any question has been proposed, either in the House or in any Committee of the whole, a motion may be made by any member, rising in his place, and without notice, and whether any other member is addressing the Chair or not, "That the question be now put," and the motion shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate.

As to the question of privilege arising in Committee, *May* says on page 258—

If complaint of a breach of privilege be made whilst the House is in Committee, the Committee reports progress thereon; or, upon an act of disorder committed in his presence, the Chairman has quitted the chair and sent for the Speaker.

MR. BRENNAN.—It is clear that when I raise a matter of privilege of substantial character it is the duty of the Committee to report progress with a view to having it considered and decided by the House. Obviously, it would be absurd for the Speaker to remain in his room looking at the disturbance outside while we are here helpless to do anything.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—Matters of privilege must be brought before the House with the Speaker in the chair. The Committee is sitting as a committee for the purpose of considering the Bill in detail.

MR. BRENNAN.—Seeing that fifteen minutes have elapsed since the last motion to report progress was submitted, and with a view to having the matter considered by the House with the Speaker in the chair, I move—

That progress be reported.

Question—That progress be reported
—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	15
Noes	30

Majority	15
----------	----	----	----

AYES.

Brennan, F.
Considine, M. P.
Cunningham, L. L.
Fenton, J. E.
Gabb, J. M.
Lazzarini, H. P.
Mahony, W. G.
Makin, N. J. O.

Maloney, Dr.
McGrath, D. C.
Nicholls, S. R.
Ryan, T. J.
Tudor, F. G.
Tellers:
Charlton, M.
Riley, E.

NOES.

Best, Sir Robert
Blundell, R. P.
Bowden, E. K.
Bruce, S. M.
Cameron, D. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph
Cook, Robert
Foster, Richard
Fowler, J. M.
Francis, F. H.
Gibson, W. G.
Greene, W. M.
Higgs, W. G.
Hill, W. C.
Hughes, W. M.
Jackson, D. S.

Jowett, E.
Lister, J. H.
Marks, W. M.
Marr, C. W. C.
Page, Dr. Earle
Poynton, A.
Prowse, J. H.
Rodgers, A. S.
Ryrie, Sir Granville
Smith, Laird
Stewart, P. G.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:
Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Mr. BRENNAN.—On a point or order,
standing order 64 provides—

Motion (by Sir JOSEPH COOK) put—

That the honorable member for Batman be
not further heard.

The Committee divided.

Ayes	28
Noes	16

Majority	12
----------	----	----	----

AYES.

Best, Sir Robert
Blundell, R. P.
Bowden, E. K.
Bruce, S. M.
Cameron, D. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph
Cook, Robert
Foster, Richard
Fowler, J. M.
Gibson, W. G.
Greene, W. M.
Higgs, W. G.
Hill, W. C.
Hughes, W. M.
Jackson, D. S.

Jowett, E.
Lister, J. H.
Marr, C. W. C.
Page, Dr. Earle
Poynton, A.
Prowse, J. H.
Rodgers, A. S.
Ryrie, Sir Granville
Smith, Laird
Stewart, P. G.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:
Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

NOES.

Brennan, F.	McGrath, D. C.
Charlton, M.	Nicholls, S. R.
Considine, M. P.	Ryan, T. J.
Cunningham, L. L.	Tudor, F. G.
Fenton, J. E.	West, J. E.
Gabb, J. M.	
Lazzarini, H. P.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Mahony, W. G.	Makin, N. J. O.
Maloney, Dr.	Riley, E.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—I draw your atten-
tion to standing order 64, relating to the
privileges of honorable members—

Every member may, each day, by written
order, admit three strangers to the gallery.

I wish to know why honorable members
have been denied this privilege to-night,
and why citizens are being prevented, on
application to their members, from hear-
ing the debate of the Committee? I want
to know by whose authority and by what
right the citizens of this country are pre-
vented from entering here?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN
(Mr. Watkins).—The honorable member
must see, from what I have quoted before,
that the question he raises is distinctly
one that should be put when the Speaker
is in the chair, and cannot be decided
in Committee.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—I understood from
your reply to the honorable member for
Batman (Mr. Brennan) that a question
of privilege when raised in Committee
must be decided by the Chairman report-
ing progress and giving the Speaker an
opportunity to deal with it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—
The Committee controls its own proce-
dure within its own ambit, and deals
with any questions arising in Committee.
I can only report any matter to the
Speaker by the resolution of the Com-
mittee as a whole.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Then I move that
you report progress in order that the ques-
tion may be decided.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—A
quarter of an hour has not elapsed since
the last decision of the Committee on the
question. In any case, the motion has
now been moved twice, and the standing
order gives me the privilege of saying

whether I shall receive any further motion of that kind.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Do I understand that you refuse to take the motion now?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—The standing order does not allow me to accept the motion now. The honorable member is, therefore, out of order.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—I am going to insist on the right of a member to exercise his privileges, as enumerated in the standing order. If you will not allow me to move that progress be reported, I am going to insist on being heard. Since I have been a member of this House, the representatives of the people here have allowed their privileges to be taken away. The military have been allowed to come into the building and to do as they like, and to-night the place is being carried on under police protection.

HONORABLE MEMBERS.—Chair!

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Chair be damned! I am going to raise my voice in protest, and I am going to be heard. I am going to say—

HONORABLE MEMBERS.—Chair! Chair!

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—Order! Clause 5—

Mr. CONSIDINE.—I intend that no business shall proceed, so far as I am concerned, until this matter has been dealt with.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—I do not wish to take any extreme steps—

Mr. CONSIDINE.—When you allow yourself to be made use of by the party opposite, who have sent their own Temporary Chairman away and put you in the chair, you ought to get out of it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—While I am here I shall occupy the position with fairness to all members, and shall carry out the rules guiding me, irrespective of the honorable member or any one else. I ask the honorable member to withdraw.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—I am not going to withdraw.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—Then I must call on the Prime Minister to take the necessary action.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES) proposed—

That the honorable member for Barrier (Mr. Considine) be suspended from the service of the Committee.

Question put. The Committee divided.

Ayes 27

Noes 16

Majority 11

AYES.

Best, Sir Robert	Jackson, D. S.
Blundell, R. P.	Jowett, E.
Bowden, E. K.	Lister, J. H.
Bruce, S. M.	Marks, W. M.
Cameron, D. C.	Marr, C. W. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph	Poynton, A.
Cook, Robert	Prowse, J. H.
Foster, Richard	Rodgers, A. S.
Fowler, J. M.	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Francis, F. H.	Smith, Laird
Greene, W. M.	Wise, G. H.
Higgs, W. G.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hill, W. C.	Burchell, R. J.
Hughes, W. M.	Story, W. H.

NOES.

Brennan, F.	Nicholls, S. R.
Catts, J. H.	Riley, E.
Considine, M. P.	Ryan, T. J.
Cunningham, L. L.	Tudor, F. G.
Fenton, J. E.	West, J. E.
Gabb, J. M.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lazzarini, H. P.	Charlton, M.
Mahony, W. G.	Makin, N. J. O.
McGrath, D. C.	

PAIRS.

Watt, W. A.	Anstey, F.
Atkinson, L.	Moloney, Parker
Bayley, J. G.	Mahon, H.
Corser, E. B. C.	Blakeley, A.
Mackay, G. H.	Catts, J. H.
Gregory, H.	Mathews, J.
Groom, L. E.	Lavelle, T. J.
Livingston, J.	Page, James
Maxwell, G. A.	Maloney, Dr.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.—I shall now report the matter to Mr. Speaker.

In the House:

Resolution reported.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES) proposed—

That the honorable member for Barrier be suspended from the service of the House.

Question put. The House divided.

Ayes 26
Noes 10

Majority 10

AYES.

Blundell, R. P.
Bowden, E. K.
Bruce, S. M.
Cameron, D. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph
Cook, Robert
Foster, Richard
Fowler, J. M.
Francis, F. H.
Greene, W. M.
Higgs, W. G.
Hill, W. C.
Hughes, W. M.
Jackson, D. S.

Jowett, E.
Lister, J. H.
Marks, W. M.
Marr, C. W. C.
Poynton, A.
Prowse, J. H.
Rodgers, A. S.
Ryrie, Sir Granville
Smith, Laird
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

NOES.

Brennan, F.
Catts, J. H.
Considine, M. P.
Cunningham, L. L.
Fenton, J. E.
Gabb, J. M.
Lazzarini, H. P.
Makin, N. J. O.
McGrath, D. C.

Nicholls, S. R.
Riley, E.
Ryan, T. J.
Tudor, F. G.
West, J. E.

Tellers:

Charlton, M.
Mahony, W. G.

PAIRS.

Watt, W. A.
Atkinson, L.
Bayley, J. G.
Corser, E. B. C.
Mackay, G. H.
Gregory, H.
Groom, L. E.
Livingston, J.
Maxwell, G. A.

Anstey, F.
Moloney, Parker
Mahon, H.
Blakeley, A.
Catts, J. H.
Mathews, J.
Lavelle, T. J.
Page, James
Maloney, Dr.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

The honorable member for Barrier was, therefore, under standing order 59, suspended for the remainder of the sitting, and withdrew from the chamber.

In Committee:

Clause 5 (Appointment of Director).

Question—That the clause be agreed to—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes 27
Noes 10

Majority 17

AYES.

Best, Sir Robert
Blundell, R. P.
Bowden, E. K.
Bruce, S. M.
Cameron, D. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph
Cook, Robert
Foster, Richard
Fowler, J. M.
Greene, W. M.
Higgs, W. G.
Hill, W. C.
Hughes, W. M.
Jackson, D. S.

Jowett, E.
Lister, J. H.
Maloney, Dr.
Marks, W. M.
Marr, C. W. C.
Poynton, A.
Prowse, J. H.
Rodgers, A. S.
Ryrie, Sir Granville
Smith, Laird
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

NOES.

Brennan, F.
Catts, J. H.
Gabb, J. M.
Lazzarini, H. P.
Makin, N. J. O.
Nicholls, S. R.

Ryan, T. J.
Tudor, F. G.

Tellers:

Charlton, M.
Fenton, J. E.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 6—

1. The Director shall receive such salary as the Governor-General determines.

2. The salary of the Director shall be paid out of moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose.

3. Travelling expenses as prescribed shall be paid to the Director on account of his expenses in travelling in the discharge of the duties of his office.

Mr. RYAN (West Sydney) [9.32].—I move—

That after the word "shall," line 1, the following words be inserted:—"subject to the approval of Parliament."

The clause will then read—"The Director shall, subject to the approval of Parliament, receive such salary as the Governor-General determines." I do not want to waste time debating the amendment, which speaks for itself. My intention is to reserve to this House authority to determine what the Director's salary shall be, and as I desire to expedite the business, I shall content myself with submitting the amendment.

Mr. MAKIN (Hindmarsh) [9.33].—

The amendment is a wise provision to retain parliamentary control. Instead of a true Democracy we have been subjected during recent years, to a system of bureaucratic control in regard to expenditure of public money, and the provision now sought to be inserted in the clause will give the people an opportunity, through their representatives in this Parliament, of expressing an opinion concerning the directorship and staffing of this particular

institution. I agree that scientific methods are essential for the proper development of this great country, but it is very desirable, in my opinion, to include the safeguard suggested by the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan). The amendment will relieve the Government of a responsibility which should properly be shouldered by the representatives of the people.

Mr. GABB.—I draw attention to the state of the Committee. [*Quorum formed.*]

Mr. RYAN.—I hope the Minister will do us the courtesy of expressing an opinion on the amendment.

Mr. GREENE (Minister for Trade and Customs—Richmond) [9.39].—I take it that the salary of the Director, like the salaries of all public servants, will come up for consideration when the Estimates are under review. In this way it will be subject, ultimately, to the approval of this House.

Mr. RYAN.—If you appoint a Director at a fixed salary for a term, this House will not be able to alter it.

Mr. GREENE.—The ordinary procedure of allowing the Executive to make the appointment and fix a salary should apply in this case. This is the invariable practice, with the exception of a few cases in which the salary is definitely laid down in a Bill, such as for the appointment of Judges. The Committee will be well advised not to accept the amendment.

Dr. MALONEY (Melbourne) [9.41].—I hope the Minister will reconsider his decision, because he knows that if the Director's salary is fixed it will be a difficult matter for Parliament to deal with it in the Estimates. I can call to mind one instance bearing upon this particular matter. When the salary of the Governor-General was under discussion in an Enabling Bill in the Victorian Parliament, the provision that the salary "shall not be less than £10,000" was altered by striking out the word "less" and inserting "more" with the result that when New South Wales endeavoured to increase the amount to £20,000, it was unable to do so because the Victorian Act limited the sum to £10,000. As Parliament will be blamed for anything that may be done in connexion with this Bill, it would be wise to retain the right to determine the salary.

Mr. RYAN.—As in the case of the Judges.

Mr. FENTON (Maribyrnong) [9.42].—The Minister's contention appears to me to be very weak, because I take it that the Director will be appointed at a fixed salary of, say, £1,000, for a term of five years. If Parliament stepped in and reduced the salary to £750 a year, the Director would have his remedy against the Government for breach of contract, because if he were a sensible man he would have his contract in black and white before he accepted the appointment. I am against the Bill absolutely, but I shall vote for the amendment in order to secure parliamentary control.

Mr. GREENE (Minister for Trade and Customs—Richmond) [9.43].—I hope the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) will not press his amendment, because if the Institute is to be a success it is very advisable that the Government of the day should have the fullest scope in the selection of the best man obtainable, subject to that control which Parliament exercises over the Estimates.

Mr. RYAN.—Do you propose to obtain a Director by inviting applications?

Mr. GREENE.—Yes, in the usual way.

Mr. RYAN.—But you will not ask applicants to "state salary required," will you?

Mr. GREENE.—It will be largely a matter of negotiation in order to get the very best man available, and, therefore, the greatest latitude should be given to the Government. I ask that the amendment be not pressed.

Mr. LAZZARINI (Werriwa) [9.45].—I hope that the honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) will persist with his amendment, and that it will be supported by those who think that Parliament should have control of the public purse. It is a strange proposal that the Government should be given an absolutely free hand, for whilst the Government are the executive authority, this Parliament has to bear the responsibility, and every individual member will have to take some of the blame for any mistake that is made. The Minister (Mr. Greene) said that the salary may be a matter of negotiation; he seems to contemplate a sort of Jewish bargaining. I am opposed to the Bill lock, stock and barrel; but as an Institute is to be created

I shall vote to provide that Parliament shall decide the salary of the Director. If we cannot get a qualified man for the amount fixed we can do without one.

Mr. PROWSE (Swan) [9.48].—At first sight there is a good deal to commend the amendment; but when one considers the matter more closely he must conclude that the clause had better be agreed to as drafted. Australia is at a great disadvantage at the present time as a result of cheeseparings in regard to the services of its experts in all Departments. Other countries are prepared to pay the best for the best, and the sooner Australia adopts that policy the better.

Mr. RYAN.—I am not suggesting any other policy.

Mr. PROWSE.—I fear that if we fix a salary of, say, £1,000 per annum, we shall possibly get a man worth that amount; and if, on the other hand, we fix a salary of £5,000, the appointee might be worth less. The question of salary had better be left open so that the Government may arrange to pay for the value they are to receive. If the Government arrange to pay £10,000 for the right type of expert he might be a very cheap man for a young country like Australia in its developmental stage.

Mr. HIGGS (Capricornia) [9.50].—The amendment might possibly hamper the Government in their choice of a man. They will have to negotiate for somebody, and we hope they will engage the best man available. They might be able by negotiation to get a good man for £4,000 or £5,000 per annum, but that man might not accept the position if he knew that the arrangement made by the Government was only tentative, and must run the gauntlet of parliamentary approval. If such a man were in the employ of a big company he might prefer to keep his present position rather than run the risk of the contract with the Government being rejected by Parliament. The desire for control by Parliament will be met by the item being placed on the Estimates each year as is the salary of the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank. If Parliament so desires the salary can be struck out or reduced.

Mr. RYAN (West Sydney) [9.52].—Honorable members who have opposed the amendment have put forward two mutually destructive arguments. The

Minister (Mr. Greene) has explained that the amendment is unnecessary, because the salary must appear upon the Estimates, and be subject to parliamentary approval. On the other hand the honorable member for Swan (Mr. Prowse) and the honorable member for Capricornia (Mr. Higgs) say that the amendment would hamper the Government in their choice of a suitable man, because a likely appointee might fear that Parliament would refuse to indorse any contract the Government made with him. I fail to see why it should be impossible for Ministers, to successfully negotiate with a competent man provided that Parliament allowed sufficient latitude in regard to salary, as I have no doubt Parliament would. The salaries of the High Court Judges are fixed by Act of Parliament; they are not left to the judgment of the Executive. Whilst in ordinary circumstances I would be prepared to yield to the request of the Minister that the amendment be not pressed, yet in the light of recent experience and my general knowledge of the manner in which the Executive have absolutely ignored Parliament in regard to the expenditure of public moneys, I am not prepared to do that. I am not unmindful of the fact that as late as the 7th July the Government, without reference to Parliament, issued a regulation under the War Precautions Act enabling them to pay out of the consolidated revenue losses incurred in the running of ships along the coast under requisition, some of those losses being probably due to the ships having been held up while the seamen's strike was in progress. In view of the fact that the Government are prepared to legislate by Executive minute, and to directly charge upon the people the expenses attendant upon such legislation, while large profits are being made by the shipping companies trading along the coast, and in view of our general knowledge of the manner in which the Executive have abused their powers in connexion with the expenditure of public funds, it is high time that we applied a stricter rule and carried out the pledges we made to our constituents to restore to Parliament the control of the public expenditure.

Mr. HIGGS (Capricornia) [9.56].—The only effect of the amendment would

be to disadvantage the Government in the selection of a suitable man. The honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) does not think for a moment that the House would turn out of office a Government who made a bad appointment; the House never has done that. I favour the Government having latitude in this matter because it is necessary that they should get the very best man available. When the Commonwealth Bank Act was passed it was provided that the Governor-General in Council should fix the salary to be paid to the Governor of the Bank.

Dr. MALONEY.—He is an absolute sweater, and the honorable member knows it.

Mr. HIGGS.—I do not agree with the honorable member. As soon as it became known that the Government wanted a manager for the Commonwealth Bank several of the banking companies called upon their chief officers to say whether or not they intended to apply for the position. Many of them thereupon said they would not be applicants. That action restricted the Government's choice, and might possibly have prevented them from getting a good man. They did, however, get one of the best banking experts in the Commonwealth, who has since done wonderful work. By negotiation the Government might be able to get for Director of the Institute a man of £4,000 per annum calibre, but if that amount were fixed by Parliament the best man available might not be worth that salary; he might be worth only £2,000. The Minister when conducting negotiations with an expert employed by some big company would have to come to Parliament and say, "We can get a good man for £4,000 per annum." Immediately honorable members would demand to know the name of the applicant. The disclosure of the name before the appointment was confirmed would prejudice the man in his private employment, and the fear of that happening might prevent him from applying. The Broken Hill Company, for instance, employs some men who are very prominent in the scientific and industrial world, and I understand that one officer of the company is paid a salary of £10,000 per annum.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—If he gets that salary he is worth it, and the company knows his value.

Mr. HIGGS.—The company realizes the value of his work, and is prepared to pay. If it was whispered abroad that the Government proposed to secure the services of the chief officer of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company his directors would probably ask him if he intended leaving the service of the company, and in the event of an affirmative reply he would probably be asked to terminate his engagement. If such a position should arise in connexion with the appointment of a Director the Government would be hampered, and would not be able to get the best man for the position. I trust the honorable member will not press his amendment.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted (Mr. RYAN'S amendment) be so inserted—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	12
Noes	28
Majority	16

AYES.

Brennan, F.
Fenton, J. E.
Lazzarini, H. P.
Mahony, W. G.
Maloney, Dr.
McGrath, D. C.
Nicholls, S. R.

Riley, E.
Ryan, T. J.
Tudor, F. G.

Tellers:
Gabb, J. M.
Makin, N. J. O.

NOES.

Blundell, R. P.
Bowden, E. K.
Bruce, S. M.
Cameron, D. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph
Cook, Robert
Foster, Richard
Fowler, J. M.
Gibson, W. G.
Greene, W. M.
Higgs, W. G.
Hughes, W. M.
Jackson, D. S.
Jowett, E.
Lister, J. H.

Marks, W. M.
Marr, C. W. C.
McWilliams, W. J.
Page, Dr. Earle
Poynton, A.
Prowse, J. H.
Rodgers, A. S.
Ryrie, Sir Granville
Smith, Laird
Stewart, P. G.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:
Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

Question so resolved in the negative.
Amendment negatived.

Dr. MALONEY (Melbourne) (10.10).
—I move—

That after the word "determines," (line 2), the following words be inserted:—"but such salary shall not be more than £1,000 per annum."

The head of a Government Department should not receive a higher salary than a member of Parliament, as he has not to go before his constituents from time to time. If there is a genuine desire to benefit and protect the country, this or any other Government can bring in a special Bill to provide for the payment of any salary they please, just as they did in the case of the late Chief Justice of Australia, Sir Samuel Griffith, when the late Treasurer (Mr. Watt) submitted a measure for the payment of a pension of £5 a day to that gentleman. In the same way the sum of £4,500 was voted to Lady Bridges. Let us consider the salaries paid to some of the greatest persons mentioned in the world's history. Pasteur was receiving £200 a year when he made his great discovery, and when he was offered £25,000 to go from Paris to Italy he refused because, he said, other men could do the work. Dr. Koch was receiving £150 a year when he made his great discovery, and Rontgen was in receipt of £200 a year when he became famous. One of the few men England regretted losing was Dr. Gresswell, who, as Chairman of the Board of Health in this State, was receiving a salary of £1,000; but he would not part with the honour of being at the head of that great Department for five times the salary.

Mr. HUGHES.—What year was that?

Dr. MALONEY.—In 1889.

Mr. HUGHES.—£1,000 per annum then is equal to about £200 now.

Dr. MALONEY.—More than that. We could, as I have said, by special Acts decide what salary should be paid, and I hope the Government will be prepared to accept my amendment. Every one who has studied scientific research will admit that it is not the highly-paid men at the top of the tree who make discoveries, but the younger men, directed by the elder brain, who achieve success. Mr. William Thomson, afterwards Lord Kelvin, after thirty years' work, said he knew no more about electricity than when he first commenced its study. If we have a great man let us pay him what Parliament thinks is a proper salary. Good men should be rewarded according to their worth.

Amendment negatived.

Question—That the clause be agreed to—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	28
Noes	4

Majority 24

AYES.

Blundell, R. P.	Lister, J. H.
Bowden, E. K.	Marks, W. M.
Bruce, S. M.	Marr, C. W. C.
Cameron, D. C.	McWilliams, W. J.
Cook, Sir Joseph	Page, Dr. Earle
Cook, Robert	Poynton, A.
Foster, Richard	Prowse, J. H.
Fowler, J. M.	Rodgers, A. S.
Francis, F. H.	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Gibson, W. G.	Smith, Laird
Greene, W. M.	Wise, G. H.
Higgs, W. G.	
Hughes, W. M.	
Jackson, D. S.	
Jowett, E.	

Tellers:

Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

NOES.

Gabb, J. M.
Tudor, F. G.

Tellers:

Fenton, J. E.
Makin, N. J. O.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 7—

(1) The Minister may at any time suspend the Director from his office for incapacity, incompetence, or misbehaviour.

(2) If the Director is so suspended the Governor-General may appoint a Board of Inquiry (consisting of three persons, one of whom shall be the chairman of the Board, and any two of whom may exercise all the powers of the Board) for investigation and report upon the charge of incapacity, incompetence, or misbehaviour preferred by the Minister.

(3) If the Director does not admit the truth of the charge preferred against him, the Board of Inquiry shall inquire into the truth of the charge, and, after fully hearing the case, shall report to the Governor-General its opinion thereon.

(4) If the charge is admitted or is found by the Board of Inquiry to be proved, the Governor-General may, if he thinks fit, call upon the Director to retire from his office, and he shall retire accordingly.

(5) If the charge is found by the Board of Inquiry not to be proved, the suspension shall be immediately removed by the Minister.

(6) Save as in the section provided, the Director shall not be removed from office during the term for which he was appointed.

Mr. HIGGS (Capricornia) [10.27].—

I hope honorable members will agree with me that the Governor-General in Council, which is really the Commonwealth Government, should have power to suspend the Director for incompetence or misbehaviour. It will be noticed that the clause states that the "Minister may at any

time suspend the Director for incapacity, incompetence, or misbehaviour," and in this connexion I draw attention to the Inter-State Commission Act, section 9, which is as follows:—

(1) The Governor-General may suspend any Commissioner from office for misbehaviour or incapacity. The Minister shall, within seven days after the suspension, if the Parliament is then sitting, or if the Parliament is not then sitting, within seven days after the next meeting of the Parliament, cause to be laid before both Houses of the Parliament a full statement of the grounds of suspension.

(2) A Commissioner who has been suspended shall be restored to office unless each House of Parliament within forty days after the statement has been laid before it, and in the same session passes an address praying for his removal on the grounds of proved misbehaviour or incapacity.

I may also point out that the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank holds office during good behaviour for a period of seven years, and is eligible for re-election. I am very glad to know that the Minister (Mr. Greene) is prepared to accept the amendment I am about to propose. The clause provides that the Director, if suspended, may be tried by the Board of Inquiry appointed by the Governor-General; but I ask honorable members if any business firm of company with a board of directors would suspend its chief officer and allow him to be tried by a board, before whom there might be laid a pile of evidence as high as the table in this chamber, as has happened in the case of public servants. We ought to maintain the prestige and power of the Commonwealth of Australia wherever possible; and I propose to strike out the word "Minister" with a view to inserting "Governor-General," which, of course, means the Governor-General in Council, or, in other words, the Government, and to adopt the words of the Inter-State Commission Act with regard to a Commissioner. Thus, if the Government wish to suspend the Director, the Minister must report to the House, which must be satisfied to carry a resolution to the effect that the Director shall be removed from office. I therefore move—

That the word "Minister," line 1, be left out with a view to insert in lieu thereof the words "Governor-General," and that sub-clauses (2) to (6) be left out with a view to insert in lieu thereof the following sub-clauses:—

(2) The Minister shall within seven days after the suspension, if the Parliament is then sitting, or if the Parliament is not then sitting, within seven days after

the next meeting of the Parliament, cause to be laid before both Houses of the Parliament a full statement of the grounds of suspension.

(3) A Director who has been suspended shall be restored to office unless each House of Parliament within forty days after the statement has been laid before it, and in the same session, passes an address paying for his removal on the grounds of proved incapacity, incompetence, or misbehaviour.

Mr. GREENE (Richmond—Minister for Trade and Customs) [10.31].—I am prepared to accept the amendment, which I think will effect a distinct improvement in the Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 8 agreed to.

Clause 9 (Powers and functions of the Director).

Mr. HIGGS (Capricornia) [10.35].—This clause will confer very great powers upon the Director, and I have some hesitation in agreeing to it. Whilst there can be no objection to the Director initiating and carrying out scientific researches, there may be some objection to allowing him to establish and award industrial research studentships and fellowships and to permitting him to make grants.

Mr. GREENE.—He cannot do any of those things without the approval of the Minister, who will necessarily be guided by his ability to get the votes through Parliament.

Mr. HIGGS.—The Minister's interjection reminds me that when I asked him if he had calculated the cost of this Institute, he replied that the matter would come up for discussion on the Estimates. Whilst I have been a member of this House I have known Estimates involving an expenditure of £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 to be passed with only four hours' consideration.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—I do not think that that will happen again.

Mr. HIGGS.—That may be so, because we are now living in a time of peace. Political parties are more evenly divided than they were during the war; and, with great respect to Ministers, it is a good thing for the country when there is a strong Opposition. However well meaning the Minister may be, the Director of the Institute will be authorized by this Bill to make grants—

Mr. GREENE.—But he can only make them subject to Ministerial approval.

Mr. HIGGS.—It does not say so.

Mr. GREENE.—Yes, it does.

Mr. HIGGS.—I beg the Minister's pardon; I had quite overlooked that fact.

Mr. MAKIN (Hindmarsh) [10.39].—I confess that I entertain a similar feeling of apprehension on this matter to that which has been voiced by the honorable member for Capricornia (Mr. Higgs). I fear that the Minister will be guided by the Director of the Institute, and that, unless there be some way of restraining the representations of the Director, we are likely to incur a large expenditure in the making of grants.

Mr. GREENE.—If the Director wishes to establish any of these scholarships, he can only do so by obtaining Ministerial approval. The Minister will then make the necessary provision on the Estimates.

Mr. MAKIN.—I am satisfied with having entered my protest, and I shall leave the matter at that.

Mr. FENTON (Maribyrnong) [10.40].—Despite the assurances of the Minister (Mr. Greene), I cannot forget that we have heard similar assurances before. Ten years of parliamentary experience have convinced me that such assurances are not borne out in actual practice. We are opening the door to a very heavy expenditure. However, I entered my protest upon the motion for the second reading of the Bill, and I repeat that protest now.

Mr. JACKSON.—For the true welfare of the people of Australia.

Mr. FENTON.—My honorable friend is very young. When he is three years older in political life he will probably have arrived at the same conclusion as I have. During my occupancy of a seat in this Chamber there have been several Ministries in power, and not one of them has kept its pledges to maintain a firm control over our expenditure. This Bill provides, not one door, but several, for very big outgoings of very little benefit to the Commonwealth.

Question.—That the clause be agreed to—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	24
Noes	8

Majority	16
----------	----

AYES.

Marr, C. W. C.
McWilliams, W. J.
Page, Dr. Earle
Poynton, A.
Prowse, J. H.
Rodgers, A. S.
Ryrie, Sir Granville
Smith, Laird
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Burchell, B. J.
Story, W. H.

NOES.

Watkins, D.

Tellers:

Fenton, J. E.
Mahony, W. G.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 10 to 19 agreed to.

Amendment (by Mr. GREENE) agreed to—

That the following new clause be inserted:—

4A. The Institute shall comprise—

- (a) a Bureau of Agriculture;
- (b) a Bureau of Industry; and
- (c) such other bureaux as the Governor-General determines.

Amendment (by Mr. GREENE) proposed—

That the following new clause be inserted:—

4B. The Governor-General may appoint Advisory Boards to advise the Director with regard to—

- (a) the general business of the Institute or any bureau thereof; and
- (b) any particular matter of investigation or research.

Mr. JOWETT (Grampians) [10.50].—

I desire to submit two amendments to this clause. I wish to have the word "may" omitted, with a view to insert the word "shall," and to insert the words "in each State" after the word "Boards."

Mr. HUGHES.—We cannot accept the first suggested amendment.

Mr. JOWETT.—What is the objection to it?

Mr. HUGHES.—It would take all control out of the Director's hands. For all practical purposes "may" is the same as "shall" in these Acts, but there must be discretion somewhere, and it should rest with the Government of the country.

Mr. JOWETT.—Then, to save time, I shall not persist with the first amend-

ment, and will content myself with moving—

That, after the word "Boards" the words "in each State" be inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

Proposed new clause, as amended, agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments; report adopted.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES) proposed—

That the intervening business be postponed until after the consideration of Notice of Motion No. 2.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [10.53].—The Prime Minister has proposed the postponement of the remaining Orders of the Day until after the consideration of notice of motion No. 2, for leave to introduce a Bill for an Act relating to industrial matters. I am most anxious to reach the consideration of that measure, but I direct attention to the fact that, according to the press, the Prime Minister on Saturday last threatened that he would pass the proposed amendment of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act in spite of the opposition of honorable members on this side. I have never known of any opposition to that Bill on the part of honorable members on this side. As a matter of fact, we have been asking for the introduction of the Bill. The adjournment of this House has been moved on more than one occasion to urge an amendment of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, to permit organizations to get to the Arbitration Court more speedily than they can do under the present law. They are prevented from getting to the Court at the present time. Now, in spite of what the Prime Minister said at Bendigo, he proposes to pass over the notice of motion for the introduction of the Bill to amend the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. I understand that he proposes to take only the first reading of the Bill dealing with industrial matters, in order that it may be circulated, and we may consider it to-morrow. Every member of this House is aware that private business is taken first to-morrow, and, if the history of this Parliament repeats itself, we shall be occupied up to 6.30 p.m. with the consideration of that business. As the Bill proposes the adoption of a new principle, I presume that the Prime Minister will

not desire that we should go straight on with its consideration, but that we should have an opportunity of considering its provisions. What this Parliament should be most anxious to do is to minimize, as far as possible, the industrial unrest existing at the present time. I agree that the disturbed feeling in the minds of the general community is not confined to Australia, but is evident in every part of the world. It is nearly impossible to secure a measure that will secure complete industrial peace, but we should not shirk our duty to do what we can to prevent industrial unrest. I suggest that the Prime Minister should let us deal with notice of motion No. 1 to-night.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE BILL.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES) agreed to—

That leave be given to bring in a Bill for an Act relating to industrial matters and the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes.

Bill presented, and (on motion by Mr. HUGHES) read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

APPLICATION OF CLOSURE MOTION.

Motion (by Mr. HUGHES) proposed—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. RYAN (West Sydney) [10.58].—There is one word I wish to say on the motion for the adjournment of the House. The Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) this afternoon moved the closure at the end of a long controversial speech. I desire to enter my protest against his action in moving the closure at the end of such a speech, because the adoption of that practice does not give other members of the House any opportunity to reply. Certainly, a very effective reply was given by the vote of the House. I should like to direct attention to the dictum of a Speaker of the House of Commons, on the 12th May, 1893, on a point raised by Lord George Hamilton. The matter is recorded as follows, at page 790, vol. 12, of the 4th series of Parliamentary Debates, 4th May, 1893 to 1st June, 1893:—

LORD G. HAMILTON.—I wish, sir, to ask your opinion as to the manner in which the closure can be moved, not only in Committee, but when the Speaker is in the chair, and I wish to ask whether it is in conformity with the spirit of the standing order for any Minister to preface his motion for the closure by a

speech of a highly controversial character and stating, with all the skill of an advocate, the reasons why the closure should be applied?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I take it that the question of the noble lord is whether the closure can be moved after a speech has been made on a general subject or after reasons given for moving it. As far as I recollect, a similar question was raised in August, 1887, when a right honorable gentleman made a long and necessarily controversial speech, and at the end of it moved the closure. The honorable and learned member for Louth raised the point, and I then told the honorable and learned member that the question had been settled by former precedents, and that it was competent for an honorable member at the close of a speech to move the closure. But after an experience of many years, I am bound to say that for an honorable member to make a controversial speech and then to move the closure is scarcely in conformity with the spirit of the rule, because such a course shuts out an answer to his speech being given.

I wish to have that extract placed on record in order that the precedent set by the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) this afternoon may not be followed on any other occasion; and I hope, if it be followed, that Parliament will give to it just as effective a reply as it gave to-day.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 11.1 p.m.

Senate.

Thursday, 29 July, 1920.

The PRESIDENT (Senator the Hon. T. Givens) took the chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPERS.

The following papers were presented:—

Defence Act.—Regulations amended—Statutory Rules 1920, No. 124.

Defence: Commonwealth Government Factories—Reports for year ended 30th June, 1919.

DEFENCE FORCE.

PAY OF IMPERIAL RESERVIST OFFICERS.

Senator FOLL asked the Minister for Defence, *upon notice*—

Why is the difference in pay between Imperial and Australian rates of pay not made up in the case of a reservist who served as an officer, as is the case with reservists of non-commissioned rank?

Senator PEARCE.—When, at the outbreak of war, the Imperial reservists were called to the colours, the Government, in view of the low rate of pay of a private of the Imperial Army (1s. per diem) approved—as an act of grace and in order that dependants of reservists in Australia might be maintained on a fitting basis—that their rates of pay and separation allowance be made up to the rates which would have been payable had they joined the Australian Imperial Force. This concession was not extended to any officer or to any reservists who attained commissioned rank after date of promotion for the reason that it was considered that the reservist was then in a position to provide for his dependants.

CORNSACKS.

DISTRIBUTION OF PROFITS.

Senator PAYNE asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

What provision is being made, or will be made, for the State of Tasmania to participate in the distribution of profits made on cornsacks by the Government?

Senator E. D. MILLEN.—Cornsacks were purchased primarily for the purpose of the Wheat Pool and the profits were distributed to the contributors to the Pool. Tasmanian purchasers of bags benefited, inasmuch as they obtained their supplies at a rate much below what would have been the ruling market rate had the supplies been obtained through the usual channels. Tasmania did not contribute to the Wheat Pool.

WAR GRATUITY BONDS.

CASHING BY LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETIES: AGENTS' COMMISSION.

Senator FOSTER asked the Minister representing the Treasurer, *upon notice*—

1. Have the Treasury issued an order that no commission is to be paid to agents where returned soldiers cash their war gratuity bonds for life assurance; and, if so, what is the reason therefor?

2. Is he aware whether this would have the effect of penalizing many returned soldiers who have taken up agency work owing to being unfitted for more arduous employment?

Senator E. D. MILLEN.—The answers are—

1. Yes. The action was taken solely in the interests of the bond-owners. The Treasury endeavours to protect the soldier by seeing

that he gets full value for his bond. Where the soldier takes out a policy which he does not intend to renew, or which he cannot renew because the annual premiums are too high, he is merely discounting his bond. This is undesirable, and cannot be allowed. To avoid trouble in the direction, the Treasury consulted the principal life assurance societies, and after consideration of their views decided that these transactions should be dealt with only by the executive officers of the societies.

2. Whilst this may penalize some returned soldiers who are life assurance agents, the action has been taken in the interests of the returned soldiers generally.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Motion (by Senator DE LARGIE) agreed to—

That Senator R. S. Guthrie be granted two months' leave of absence to attend to urgent public business elsewhere.

UNLAWFUL ASSEMBLIES BILL.

Motion (by Senator E. D. MILLEN) agreed to—

That leave be given to introduce a Bill for an Act to prohibit meeting for unlawful purposes in the vicinity of the Parliament and for other purposes.

Bill presented, and read a first time.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.

Motion (by Senator E. D. MILLEN) agreed to—

That in accordance with the provisions of the Committee of Public Accounts Act 1913-19, Senators Bolton, Buzacott, and J. D. Millen be appointed to fill the vacancies now existing on the Joint Committee of Public Accounts.

PAPUA BILL.

In Committee (Consideration resumed from 28th July, *vide* page 2996):

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 (Amendment of section 20).

Senator THOMAS (New South Wales) [3.8].—I understand that if this Bill is passed, a certain area of land in Papua will become freehold. Certain British investors secured land in Papua and have so far been unable to obtain the deeds for it, and the purpose of this Bill is to enable them to do so.

Senator RUSSELL.—Yes.

Senator THOMAS.—In that case a certain area of land in Papua will become freehold, and I take it that the rest of the land there will remain leasehold.

Senator RUSSELL.—No. From the day we assumed possession of the Territory no land has been granted in fee-simple, but there was some land the freehold of which was parted with before we took possession.

Senator THOMAS.—Then we are to understand that the purpose of the Bill is to deal with some land the freehold of which was granted or arranged for before we took possession of the Territory?

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [3.9].—Yes; I think I can make the matter clear to honorable senators. Ten years before the Commonwealth took over possession of Papua, acting under the British law then existing in the Territory, a man took a twenty-five years' lease of certain land with the option of purchase. When he came to exercise his option of purchase after paying rent for the land for ten years, we were legislating for the Territory. There was some dispute as to the area involved. Our officials claimed that it was 6,000 acres, and Mr. Wickham, who desired to purchase the land, claimed that the area was under 3,000 acres; but the area is now known to be less than 1,800 acres. While this matter was being considered, the Commonwealth Parliament passed legislation forbidding any one to receive the freehold of land in Papua, but we did not take the power to interfere with any existing contracts with the British Government. Senator Thomas will recollect that when the Commonwealth took over the Northern Territory we prohibited the alienation of land there in freehold, but recognised contracts for the sale of land which had been entered into with the South Australian Government. I am glad to say that there is only one case of this kind demanding our attention, but if there had been others I still should have contended that the Commonwealth should recognise them. However, only one small contract is involved, and in assenting to this Bill we are not establishing any precedent for the future.

Clause agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; report adopted.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS BILL.

In Committee (Consideration resumed from 28th July, *vide* page 2996):

Clauses 1 to 3 agreed to.

Clause 4 (Forms to be left at dwellings).

Senator SENIOR (South Australia) [3.13].—I should like an explanation of the meaning of this clause. In its present form it is somewhat difficult to grasp. The Government propose to omit from sub-section 2 of section 10 of the principal Act the word "dwelling," and to insert in lieu thereof the word "building." They further propose to omit the word "house" from the sub-section. Thus there seems to be a conflict involved. It is proposed to omit the word "dwelling" and to substitute for it the word "building," although, in my judgment, a "dwelling" is a "building." Similarly, it is intended to omit the word "house," although a house is a "building." I should like to know the meaning of the proposed amendments in the principal Act.

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [3.15].—For the information of honorable senators, let me say that in one part of the principal Act the term "building" is used, in another part the word "dwelling," and in still another part the term "dwelling house." We desire, for the sake of simplicity, to make the Act uniform throughout, and to bring its provisions into harmony with the Acts Interpretation Act. In reply to Senator Senior, may I point out that a "building," for example, may not be a "dwelling," but a stable. There is no principle involved in the amendments proposed. If we leave the definition of words to the parliamentary draftsman, I feel sure that the result will prove satisfactory.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 8 agreed to.

Clause 9 (Occupiers to observe secrecy).

Senator SENIOR (South Australia) [3.17].—Here again a similar difficulty crops up. Under this clause it is proposed to amend the principal Act by inserting after the word "officer" the words "or occupier of a dwelling," although in a previous part of the Statute those words are not being retained.

Senator RUSSELL (Victoria—Vice-President of the Executive Council) [3.18].—Under this clause a publican or the keeper of a big boarding-

house will be bound to secrecy in regard to individual census forms. Formerly no such onus was upon him. Under this provision, the manager of the Grand Hotel, for example, will be bound to regard all census forms filled in by private persons resident there as confidential documents. It is only right that people should be thus protected.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 10 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; report adopted.

ARBITRATION (PUBLIC SERVICE) BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from 22nd July (*vide* page 2911), on motion by Senator PEARCE—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Senator EARLE (Tasmania) [3.20].—This Bill is altogether too important to be allowed to go into Committee without some discussion at the second-reading stage. I regret that I have not been able to prepare as fully as I should like my remarks upon a measure which is likely to have such important effects on the industrial and national life of Australia. No other question exercises the thoughts of public men to-day to anywhere near the same extent as that of bringing about industrial peace. It is the very essence of Australia's welfare to obtain greater harmony and better feeling among the workers, both employers and employees. Naturally, I welcome any measure which has for its object the bringing about of such better conditions.

From my rather cursory examination of it, this seems to be a measure of conciliation, providing for the investigation of industrial disputes or want of harmony between employers and employed, and for arriving at a decision and understanding, if possible, in a voluntary way. I must express my regret that the Government, when dealing with this question, did not make some effort to handle those cases which cannot be met by conciliation. We know that such cases exist. The greatest troubles arising from the existing system of arbitration for the settlement of industrial disputes are, first, the inability of those who have grievances to get before the Court—

Senator ROWELL.—There will not be that difficulty under this Bill.

Senator EARLE.—I admit that that difficulty will be largely removed; and the second is to enforce the awards of the Court when made. A large number of organizations are at the present time seeking the investigation and settlement of their grievances. The facilities provided for the consideration of those grievances have been so limited that it has been absolutely impossible for the Court to deal with them, and so a great number of cases have to be held in abeyance, and the disputes gradually become more serious. Bodies of men who ask for the consideration of their cases, and fail to get it, naturally feel further aggrieved, and a matter that might have been settled with very little difficulty at the beginning becomes aggravated to such an extent that it is very difficult to settle it at all. There is no doubt that a good many of such cases might have been settled quite easily if we had had the tribunal which this Bill makes possible.

There is another set of cases which are governed by direct actionists, on whichever side they may happen to be—whether employers or employed—and these people will not submit to any judicial trial and settlement of their troubles. The Government might, when considering this question, have made some effort to include in this Bill a provision by which those cases could be dealt with. I have outlined before what I thought was a practicable scheme for their settlement, and I have yet to learn that it is not practicable. We need to bring the responsibility of the observance of an award of the Arbitration Court home to the individual who is apt to break it. It is of no use to hold an association responsible unless it is compelled to transfer the responsibility to its members.

Senator PAYNE.—You can do that only through its funds.

Senator EARLE.—The honorable senator is quite right. It can be done only by compelling the association to have to its credit at some approved banking institution a certain fund representing so much per head of its membership. If this method were followed, I believe a scheme could be evolved by which individuals affected by an award would be compelled to obey it. I say unhesitatingly that the

main desire of the people of Australia is to do away with strikes, lockouts, and industrial warfare generally. I am convinced also that that is the desire of the majority of those men who participate in industrial disturbances. Men often become involved in industrial troubles against their will, as I have learnt from a very intimate knowledge of such things. If there were in existence an Act empowering the tribunal trying these cases, or the Judge of the Arbitration Court, or whatever you may call him, to levy upon those who ignore an award and continue to redress their grievances by direct action, I am absolutely sure that the vast majority of the workers of Australia would be behind it.

I intend to support this Bill because I believe it comes a little nearer to what we desire. It will give to those organizations which desire to get before some tribunal for an investigation, if not a settlement of their grievances, at least an opportunity to have them heard. I hope that, on some future occasion, this or some other Government will grasp the more serious problem, and present to this Chamber a Bill which will compel the lawless section of the people, whether they are employers or employees, to abide by the award of the lawful tribunal.

Senator J. D. MILLEN.—The employers in this case are the Government.

Senator EARLE.—I understand that this Bill applies to all industrial disputes. Am I to gather that it affects the Public Service only? If so, I am very sorry. I admitted that it was a very cursory glance that I had given to the Bill. If the Government are applying it to the Public Service, why do they not apply it also to the general community?

Senator J. D. MILLEN.—We have to find out afterwards if they are doing so.

Senator EARLE.—If the Ministry intend to introduce another Bill dealing with employees generally, I hope it will contain those provisions to which I have referred.

Senator SENIOR (South Australia) [3.32].—The purpose of this Bill is to create an independent tribunal to which Commonwealth civil servants may apply for the settlement of any disputes as to wages, conditions of employment, and other questions affecting their general well-being. Some time

ago the attention of honorable senators was called by means of a circular to the large number of cases pending in the Arbitration Court. Some of these cases, it was stated, have been before the Court for two years, and therefore it seems very desirable that some attempt should be made to remove this congestion. This Bill represents one such attempt, and therefore it demands our careful consideration.

One or two features of the measure call for comment, and, perhaps, objection. There is, for instance, the proposal to reduce the number of members to constitute an organization.

Senator PEARCE.—Clause 5 provides for the registration of an organization of less than 100 employees, if at least three-fifths of such employees are members of it.

Senator SENIOR.—I admit that, but I point out that there is a possibility of certain branches of the Civil Service being split up into small sections or watertight compartments of employees, numbering possibly twenty or ten. Three-fifths of that number would constitute a very small organization indeed, and yet under this Bill that section of a union will have the right to an award which may be made a common rule affecting all the employees in that particular branch in the Public Service. The measure is very important, and may have far-reaching effects.

In one of the later clauses there is provision preventing the employment of counsel by any person or organization in a plaint before the Arbitrator, and therefore no costs are to follow any award. I am not anxious to build up heavy costs against any organization, but I urge that the Arbitrator will probably require some assistance, and assessors, who may be necessary to guide his judgment, should be entitled to some remuneration. At present in connexion with Arbitration Court proceedings a levy has to be struck on members to meet any costs incurred. It would be obviously unfair if an organization, when appearing before the Arbitrator, had to meet skilled legal representatives of the Government. There should be some provision that before the Court they should stand on equal terms with the Department in the case.

Senator HENDERSON.—Would the honorable senator apply the same principle in connexion with outside unions?

Senator SENIOR.—I think that in the outside Arbitration Courts costs follow a verdict; but in this case that practice will not be followed, and common-sense dictates that there is a difference. Our attention has recently been directed to another Bill relating to a similar matter, and I must confess that since this measure has been brought before us I have not had an opportunity of giving it the attention it deserves. I have, however, been able to see that many of its clauses demand careful attention, and perhaps revision. If we are to have an efficient, we must have a contented, Service, and only in that way can we secure economy. The introduction of this measure, is, I believe, an attempt to meet the complaint that has been justly raised in connexion with the delay in dealing with cases before the Arbitration Court, and an effort to hasten the time when a decision in the case of civil servants can be given. The Service stands entirely apart from other organizations, as its representatives are not allowed to employ counsel.

Senator PEARCE.—Others are not allowed to employ counsel; what is the honorable senator talking about?

Senator SENIOR.—I am speaking of arbitration; and if I do not know as much about the matter as does the Minister for Defence, it is because I have not had the opportunity that he has had of perusing the provisions of the principal Act, or of being apprised of its contents in the way that he has.

Senator FOLL.—Other organizations can employ a representative to appear on their behalf, but they must not have a lawyer.

Senator PEARCE.—That is so.

Senator SENIOR.—Is the Minister for Defence prepared to say that a similar privilege is to be given to the civil servants when its representatives come before the Court?

Senator PEARCE.—Absolutely.

Senator SENIOR.—The civil servants can select certain representatives to appear before the Court to lead their case?

Senator PEARCE.—Yes.

Senator SENIOR.—Well, that removes one objection, and it is certainly a

point that the Minister for Defence did not make clear in moving the second reading of the Bill.

As there are other points in connexion with the Bill which need careful revision, I hope the Minister for Defence will give us further time to consider it. I am not suggesting, however, that its passage should be unnecessarily delayed, but we should be given an opportunity of dealing with it in the most effective way. The powers of the Arbitrator are, I now understand, to be co-equal with those of a Judge of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, and similar facilities are to be given to civil servants as are enjoyed by those in outside Courts.

According to the Bill, when an award is given, it has to be laid before Parliament for thirty days before it becomes law. If Parliament should not be sitting at the time, the award has to be laid before Parliament as soon as it meets. But the award will not be effective until thirty days after.

Senator DUNCAN. — That requires amending.

Senator SENIOR. — It certainly does, as an award may be made towards the end of the year, when Parliament is not sitting, and would probably have to remain in suspense until about April. In justice to the members of the Civil Service, the award should take effect from the time at which it is given, irrespective of the date on which it is laid before Parliament.

I heartily indorse the general principle of the Bill, because I believe it will be of great assistance to the Service; but I earnestly hope that its passage will not be unnecessarily hurried. I am sure honorable senators desire to give it their best attention before it leaves this Chamber. It will, I believe, be the means of relieving the congestion that has occurred in our Arbitration Court, and to that extent it is a move in the right direction.

Senator THOMAS (New South Wales) [3.48]. — I am very sorry that we are called upon to discuss the second reading of this Bill before the report, of which we have heard so much, and to which I have referred on several occasions, is in our hands. Although Mr. McLachlan's report has been laid on the table of the Senate, honorable senators have not yet received copies. I understand that it is

in the printer's hands; but, whatever the reasons may be for the delay, we have not had an opportunity of perusing it. By reading what has been published in the newspapers, we have been able to gather some idea of Mr. McLachlan's views on the Public Service generally; and it would appear that he is strongly opposed to an Arbitration Court for the Civil Service. I have a very high opinion of Mr. McLachlan, and I have always regarded him as one who has rendered valuable service. I venture to say that only those who were intimately connected with Mr. McLachlan, and in charge of Departments employing a large number of public servants, can correctly estimate the value of the services he rendered. I can quite understand, however, that, in common with other people, Mr. McLachlan has some limitations. He entered the Public Service at quite an early age, and practically for all his life was surrounded by the atmosphere of the Service, and impressed by its traditions. It is quite possible, therefore, that his views in opposition to an Arbitration Court for the Public Service may not be of very great value, or such as to influence honorable senators who have favoured arbitration in the past to the extent of causing them to alter their views. Yet, seeing that Mr. McLachlan was asked by the present Government to report on the Public Service, I do think that, before we are called upon to deal with the proposals which may be the outcome of his report, we should have time to study it. Personally, I favour public servants being given an opportunity to take their complaints to an Arbitration Court. I believe that it was a Labour Government, of which Senator Pearce and I were members, who introduced the measure providing for an appeal to an Arbitration Court by employees of the Public Service. I still hold that they should have the same right to appeal to an Arbitration Court as is conceded to employees in outside industries.

In moving the second reading of the Bill, the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) explained that one of the purposes of the measure is to overcome the congestion in the Arbitration Court. A large number of cases are waiting to be dealt with, and there

is a good deal of discontent and dissatisfaction in the Service because complaints cannot be heard. When the Minister made this statement, I asked, by interjection, why we should not appoint another Judge to assist in the work. I am prepared now to admit that, in his reply, the Minister convinced me that he was right and I was wrong. He pointed out that employees of the Public Service are differently placed from employees outside the Service. I understand that there are now two Judges hearing Public Service cases, and the Minister reminded us that it must complicate matters if one Judge dealing with the plaintiff of one division of the Service gives a decision which is not in accord with the decision given by another Judge dealing with a plaintiff from a different division of the Service. Confusion follows. In the circumstances, I agree that it would be better if an arbitrator were appointed whose duties would be confined to the consideration of Public Service cases, and to that extent I favour the proposal of the Government.

I understand, from reading clause 3 of the Bill, that all public servants, temporary as well as permanent, will come under the operation of this measure.

Senator PEARCE.—That is so.

Senator THOMAS.—Does that include employees of the Public Service in Departments now under the Public Service Commissioner, and also those employed in the Naval and Military Departments and under the Commonwealth Commissioner for Railways?

Senator PEARCE.—No. It will not include those employees under the Commissioner for Railways or in the Naval and Military Departments.

Senator THOMAS.—We are to understand, then, that employees in the Departments mentioned will be exempt from the operation of this Bill. Temporary as well as permanent employees of the Departments coming under the operation of the Bill will be affected by the decisions of the Arbitrator. I should like to know to what extent that represents a difference from existing conditions. We shall no doubt be employing temporarily a number of carpenters. They may be affected by an award of the tribunal proposed to be set up under this Bill, and that award may differ from the

award given to carpenters generally by the Conciliation and Arbitration Court dealing with persons outside the Public Service. I should like to know what would happen in a case of that kind. I remember that at one time we had some difficulty in dealing with temporary employees of the Public Service who were members of a union working under an award of the Arbitration Court. It was found that a person working temporarily for the Government might be asked to work under conditions differing from, and in some cases more favorable than, those of an award of the Arbitration Court. I point out that such a condition of affairs might make it difficult for the Government to temporarily employ any one who is a member of a union working under an outside award. The Minister might deal with that difficulty when replying to the debate on the second reading.

I should like to see a Judge as chairman of the proposed Arbitration Court, with assessors to help him. I do not favour any proposal for the selection of a representative of the Service on the Board controlling these matters. In dealing with wages, hours, and general conditions of the Public Service, I think it is preferable that the Arbitrator should be assisted by two assessors. One of the assessors might very reasonably be chosen by a vote of the public servants generally. No doubt he would be chosen from the General Division, in which there is a greater number of employees than are included in the Clerical or Professional Division.

Senator FOLL.—Would not each particular branch of the Service have its own representative when its case was under consideration.

Senator THOMAS.—My idea is that two assessors to assist the Arbitrator should be appointed for a term of five years or seven years. One of the assessors might be a representative of the Public Service generally, and the other might be chosen by the Government to represent the departmental side, and would probably be selected from the Professional or Clerical Division.

Senator FOLL.—One man will not know the conditions of all branches of the Service.

Senator WILSON.—That would be two to one on the Bench.

Senator FOSTER.—The honorable senator's proposal is merely the Wages Board system over again.

Senator THOMAS.—I take it that that is practically what the Bill proposes.

Senator DUNCAN.—The Government proposal is to create an Arbitration Court—not a Wages Board—exclusively for the Public Service.

Senator THOMAS.—A Wages Board ordinarily deals with a specific industry, and the Public Service may, for this purpose, be regarded as one Government industry. No matter outside the Public Service can come before the proposed tribunal.

Senator FOSTER.—I suggest to the honorable senator that there is a great deal of difference between the duties of a mechanic in the Post Office and those of a clerk in the Treasury.

Senator THOMAS.—That is so; but my suggestion is that there should be one assessor, probably selected from the General Division by the employees generally, and another selected by the Government, probably from the Clerical or Professional Division.

Senator FOLL.—The honorable senator is suggesting professional pleaders.

Senator THOMAS.—Assessors to assist the Arbitrator. If honorable senators generally prefer to leave the settlement of these matters to one person, well and good; but I have stated the kind of tribunal that I should personally favour.

I hope that the Government will be satisfied with carrying the second reading of this Bill, and will not bring it on for consideration in Committee until we have had a fair opportunity of studying Mr. McLachlan's report.

Senator FOLL (Queensland) [4.4].—I have been somewhat disappointed with this Bill. During the last election campaign it was stressed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes), and most of those taking up the same platform, that there is very great need in Australia for industrial reform. It was also stated at the time that one of the best methods to secure industrial reform is to bring into operation round-table conferences between employers and employees. So far as the Government were concerned, it was stated, as a matter of policy, that the general principle of arbitration as it is in operation at the present time had not

proved the success which had been anticipated, and that, in order to secure industrial peace in the future, it would be necessary to resort to some other method. Here is an excellent opportunity for the Government to give effect to some of the promises which they made in regard to industrial reform.

While Senator Thomas was speaking, Senator Duncan rightly interjected that, under this Bill, all the Government propose is to create an Arbitration Court exclusively for the public servants of the Commonwealth. There is nothing connected with that tribunal which will be different from the Court to which Commonwealth public servants already have access. Instead of their being required to go before a Judge of the Arbitration Court, they are to be given a Judge of their own, and upon practically the same terms as have heretofore obtained. Yesterday we dealt with a Bill which provides for the appointment of a Board of Management for our Public Service. To-day, we are asked to sanction the appointment of an Arbitrator who will have power to overrule anything which may be done by that Board. I wish to see both the Government and their employees represented upon the Board. If that course be followed, the Public Service associations will have an opportunity of joining in round-table conferences, at which the conditions obtaining in our Public Service can be discussed. But, under the Bill which we considered yesterday, the Government propose to appoint a Board to control our Public Service, and that body will be expected to see that the Service is run upon business-like lines. Yet it is to have no voice in determining such questions as the hours of labour, rates of pay, and the conditions of employment. I had hoped that when an amending Public Service Bill was submitted an attempt would be made by the Government to give effect to the election pledges which were recently made by them from practically every platform in Australia. I recollect that, in Queensland, the employees of a certain branch of the ironworkers' trade hold regular round-table conferences with the ironmasters, with the result that upon very few occasions indeed were they obliged to appeal to the Arbitration Court. The

results of those conferences were eminently satisfactory to both parties. We have been prating a lot about the desirableness of formulating means for the preservation of industrial peace. Whilst it is generally admitted that our present arbitration system is by no means satisfactory, I had hoped that, when the Government brought down a Bill relating to the Public Service, they would have made some honest attempt to establish the tribunals which they promised during the recent election campaign. In this measure, however, nothing is being attempted in that direction. The Government are merely saying to our public servants, "Instead of going to the Arbitration Court as at present constituted, we intend to give you an extra Judge to deal exclusively with your cases." Under that system we shall be no farther advanced than we were under the old system.

Senator KEATING (Tasmania) [4.12].—I am not sure that all honorable senators appreciate—I know that I did not do so until recently—the full significance of the measure which is now under consideration. In some of the clauses of this Bill reference is made to the existing Arbitration Act, and from those references honorable senators may be disposed to conclude that, if this Bill be passed, the public servants of the Commonwealth will still be—to some extent at least—subject to the provisions of the Public Service Arbitration Act 1911. As a matter of fact, in such circumstances that Act will become an absolute dead letter. The only references in the measure now before us, either to the general Statute dealing with Commonwealth conciliation and arbitration, or to the Public Service Arbitration Act of 1911, are references of convenience for the purpose of definition. For example, in clauses 4 and 5 of the Bill reference is made to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904-1918, and elsewhere to the Public Service Arbitration Act of 1911, but only for the purpose of definition. But should this measure be passed by Parliament, it, and it alone, will be the Statute which will in future govern the Commonwealth Public Service in regard to arbitration matters.

Senator HENDERSON.—Will the honorable senator look at sub-clauses 3 and 4 of clause 11?

Senator KEATING.—I shall come to them presently.

In his speech this afternoon Senator Foll stated that this measure does nothing more than make provision for arbitration as heretofore in the case of our public servants, apart from constituting a special Court to deal with their grievances. I would direct attention to the fact that the Bill goes very much further than that. Reference has been made by way of interjection to clause 11, in which provision is made for the transfer of existing disputes from the present Arbitration Court to the tribunal which it is proposed to establish under this Bill. That clause will also prevent the present Arbitration Court from dealing with Public Service complaints which are not pending at the time this measure becomes law.

Senator PEARCE.—The honorable senator does not object to that?

Senator KEATING.—No. I am merely pointing out that if this Bill be passed the existing Public Service legislation in regard to arbitration will become a dead letter.

Clause 16 provides that—

In making any determination under this Act the Arbitrator shall not be restricted to the specific claims made or to the subject matter of the claim, but may include in the determination any matter or thing which the Arbitrator thinks necessary in the interests of the public or of the Public Service.

That is a very extensive power to vest in an Arbitrator. The Arbitrator will have some dispute brought before him between a claimant organization and the Government—

Senator FOLL.—That provision will take away the powers of the proposed Board of Management to a greater extent than I thought.

Senator KEATING.—Exactly. The Arbitrator will deal with the issue which is brought before him. But if incidentally he thinks that in the interests of the Public Service he may make any award outside the whole scope of this issue, he will be empowered to make it. Under this provision I can predict a great sea of conflict between the Arbitrator and the Board of Management which it is proposed to establish under the measure which we were discussing yesterday.

Senator FOSTER.—It would be practically a hopeless position.

Senator KEATING. — Undoubtedly. The Arbitrator and the Board would inevitably come into collision. We are asked to clothe the Arbitrator with a general power to make any order or award that he may think fit.

Senator PEARCE.—Has any conflict occurred under our Public Service Arbitration Act because that provision has been in the principal Act from its inception.

Senator KEATING.—But one has to remember that the Judges who have hitherto acted as arbitrators have dealt with Public Service matters merely as incidental to their ordinary duties. They have dealt with arbitration matters generally only as incidental to their ordinary duties. But under this Bill it is proposed to create a tribunal for no other purpose than to deal with Public Service arbitration cases. The Judge appointed to deal with these cases will naturally regard himself as a specialist. There is every reason, therefore, to assume that he will come into conflict with the authority which will be charged with the general administration of our Public Service.

Senator FOLL.—Clause 16 will give him the power practically to control the whole of the Public Service.

Senator KEATING.—That is so.

Then clause '19 provides—

No determination of the Arbitrator made under this Act shall be challenged, appealed against, reviewed, quashed, or called in question or be subject to prohibition or mandamus in any Court on any account whatever.

Whilst I recognise that it is desirable that finality in regard to determinations of this kind shall be reached as speedily as possible, we are going a very long way when we declare that no determination by the Arbitrator shall be subject to prohibition or mandamus. Honorable senators who belong to the legal profession will confirm my statement that applications for writs of prohibition are always founded upon a contention that the Court has lacked the requisite jurisdiction. Only in such cases is an application made for a writ of prohibition. Appeals generally relate to the determination of issues of fact or of law in regard to which the tribunal possesses undoubted jurisdiction, but writs of prohibition are resorted to only where it usurps a jurisdiction which it does not possess.

Under this Bill we shall be establishing an autocrat, because no matter what he may do we cannot even question it by saying, "You have gone outside your jurisdiction." He has made a determination or award, and we cannot question it. It is not a question of appeal; we cannot even say that he had no right to touch the matter.

We need to walk very warily in regard to this measure. I am not opposed to the principle of arbitration in dealing with the troubles of the Public Service, although, personally, I very much prefer the system referred to by Senator Foll to-day, and Senator Fairbairn yesterday, comprising something in the nature of a round-table conference, after the manner of that which has been adopted in the United Kingdom as the result of the Whitley report. It was found there in the later days of the war that those governmental activities which were concerned with the output of munitions and other war work were able to carry on with very little industrial trouble by some such system as that recommended in the Whitley report. As the result of the successful application of the principles of that report, namely, the representation of employers and employees at something in the nature of round-table discussions, it was thought advisable to extend it to the ordinary branches of the Civil Service in the United Kingdom as they exist and function in times of peace. Honorable senators will have noticed from the *Fortnightly Review* and other magazines that competent writers on the subject pointed out the success which has attended the gradual extension of principles of that kind to Departments of the Public Service of the United Kingdom.

Senator ELLIOTT.—But they do not elect the Board of Management. Senator Fairbairn wanted the employees to elect their representatives on the Board, which I think is wrong.

Senator KEATING.—The Whitley report deals more with conditions of employment and rates of remuneration, and prevents those industrial troubles which have been so frequent of late years. I am not against the principle of arbitration if honorable senators think it desirable, although I would much prefer the other method; but we must be very careful before we commit ourselves to establishing a totally new tribunal with unlimited

powers of the kind provided for in this Bill, and in respect of whose actions there can be little, if any, criticism.

Again, I would warn honorable senators that by passing this measure as it stands we are possibly putting two authorities into conflict one with the other, namely, the Board of Management referred to in another Bill, and the Arbitrator appointed under this Bill, whose functions will go beyond arbitration.

Senator FOSTER.—In this Bill the Board of Management is not referred to; the reference is always to the Commissioner.

Senator KEATING.—I take it that when the other Bill is carried the necessary amendments substituting "Board of Management" for "Commissioner" will be made in this Bill.

Senator DUNCAN (New South Wales) [4.24].—As one who has been a supporter for many years of the arbitration method of settling industrial disputes, and regulating conditions of employment, I welcome any Government proposal that will extend the opportunities of any branch of employees in the Public Service to have their industrial conditions so regulated; but I am not at all sure that we are taking the right step in, as it were, segregating the civil servants from all other employees in the community, and declaring that they shall be a distinct section, separate from the rest of our industrial life. I see here, too, a very grave danger, so far as the proposals of the Government in this Bill will affect the general principles of unionism. I do not know what attitude will be adopted towards these provisions by the unions outside. Quite a number of unions embrace in their membership not only the employees of private enterprise, but also employees within the Government Service. The electrical trade union, for instance, embraces all men employed in the electrical trade throughout the community, as well as all those doing electrical work in the Post and Telegraph Service. It is proposed by the Government in this Bill to set up a distinct tribunal before which only those unions whose membership is confined entirely to the Civil Service will be able to appear. The result will be that unions which have members not only outside, but inside, the Service will be forced either to consent to the loss of those of their members who are within

the Service, or, by means of some subterfuge, to agree to their members within the Service forming themselves into a separate organization and registering as such under this measure, or under the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act. I have read the measure carefully in regard to that point, and I can see a good deal of trouble sticking out ahead if the Government proposal is carried in its present form.

Senator FOLL.—There might be two different awards for members of the same union.

Senator DUNCAN.—I was about to point that out. The branch of the union formed to secure industrial redress for those employed in the Service may be working under one set of conditions and the rest of the members of the union employed by private enterprise may be working under quite another. That would not be conducive to industrial peace. Either the members of the organization within the Service or those outside the Service would be dissatisfied. It would be wise, in the interests of industrial peace and good-fellowship, and for the sake of all the members of the organization both within and without the Service, to permit any union whose membership covers both classes of employees to register and appear on behalf of its members before the Arbitrator whom the Government propose to appoint. I confess, at once, that I do not like the idea of declaring the civil servants to be a distinct portion of the community, with whom nobody else must have anything to do.

Senator KEATING.—They will be offered separate representation in Parliament soon.

Senator DUNCAN.—I suppose that will be the next step. Victoria had experience of that sort of thing in days gone by, when, as the result of a certain industrial upheaval, the civil servants were set aside as a distinct portion of the community. A trial was then made of the system of separate representation for the Service in Parliament, but it failed dismally. The members of the Service were continually fighting to get back to their old position as ordinary citizens of the community. I think they have every right to regard themselves at all times, and in all ways, as citizens, with full citizen rights. In this measure, the Government tell them that certain of their

rights are to be taken away from them, and that they can do some things only in a certain way, and according to a fixed plan. I do not like it, for the reasons I have put forward. I should like to see an amendment made in Committee so that those unions which cover both men in the Service and men outside will be able to conduct cases for their members either before this or some other tribunal. It would have been, I believe, far better if we could have made provision for the extension of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act, so that these men might get prompt attention and relief through the provisions of that Statute.

The point brought forward by Senator Senior regarding the associations which may register under clause 5 is not very vital. That clause provides that an association of less than 100 employees in the Service may be registered as an organization if its membership comprises at least three-fifths of all those employed in the industry in the Service. While there may not be at present any branch of the Service with so few employees as indicated by that clause, we propose, in the near future, to create one or more Departments which may for a considerable time have less than 100 employees. It is intended, for instance, by another measure to establish a separate Department of Audit, which may not for a considerable time have as many as 100 employees. Is it to be said that those men are not to obtain industrial relief or any regulation of their conditions of employment because they are few in number? I can easily imagine other branches of the Government Service in which there will be for a long time less than 100 employees, who will still be equally deserving with other branches of the Service that have larger numbers of employees, of the right to secure the redress of their industrial grievances.

Senator SENIOR.—The Clerical Division to-day spreads through many different Departments of the Service.

Senator DUNCAN.—Yes, but under the Audit Bill we propose to set up an entirely new branch of the Service, under conditions different from those obtaining in any other branch.

I object, also, to the clause which provides that there shall be no appeal from the decision of the Arbitrator. Here again I think we are looking

for trouble. It will be absolutely impossible for any Arbitrator to make himself entirely familiar with the whole range of the Service. We hear constant complaints from Ministers that it is not possible for them to make themselves thoroughly familiar with the conditions even in their own Departments. How, then, is any Arbitrator charged with the responsibility of dealing with the whole Service and its activities, to make himself familiar with the whole field, and so to be able to regulate the industrial conditions of all the employees of the Government of the Commonwealth?

Senator PEARCE.—He has no Parliament and party and Cabinet on his hands.

Senator DUNCAN.—Even so, the job which the Government propose to give him is too big for him to handle in all cases with satisfaction to himself, the Government, the Service, and the people of Australia. It would be far better to provide for an appeal to the Arbitration Court, or some other tribunal, in certain cases, where men feel that they are suffering under a gross injustice or through a miscarriage of justice. That is not much to ask for. I feel sure that the organizations outside will ask that some right of appeal should be established where it is evident that the decision given by the Arbitrator is not in accord with the facts of the case, or on all-fours with the evidence that has been placed before him. It has been pointed out with truth that the powers of the Arbitrator are very wide. His powers are simply enormous under this Bill, and it will be possible for him to do almost anything. Yet we are not to provide for any appeal from his decisions, because clause 19 lays it down absolutely that from his decisions there shall be no appeal whatever. He may make a determination that is not in accord with an award of the Arbitration Court. This matter has already been mentioned during the debate. Trouble will arise in unions that embrace members both inside and outside the Public Service if the Arbitrator determines that wages inside the Service are to be lower than those outside the Service. On the other hand, if he determines that wages inside are to be higher than those outside the Service, persons engaged in private enterprise will not thank the Government for providing such a rod for their backs.

The question raised by Senator Senior concerning the coming into operation of an award is important, because it would be possible for men, after fighting their case before the Arbitrator, and securing some redress, to be denied the enjoyment of this relief by delay, and, perhaps, compelled to work for months under the old conditions. This would create a very serious position, and I appeal to the Government to provide either that the award shall come into operation at once, or, if delayed, be made retrospective. This is only a fair request, made in the interests of the men and of industrial peace. I have no more to say at this stage, but, when the Bill is in Committee, I shall endeavour to secure the amendment of some of the clauses to which I have referred.

Senator ELLIOTT (Victoria) [4.37].—I welcome the attempt by the Government to deal with the present industrial unrest that besets the community; but, with other honorable senators, I am disappointed that they have not favoured the appointment of a Board instead of an Arbitrator. The Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) has stated his intention to introduce this system for the settlement of industrial disputes outside the Public Service. Surely if it is good for industrial organizations outside, it is quite as good for those within the Service. I suggest, therefore, that the Government should reconstruct the measure along the lines indicated. Associated with the Arbitrator there should, I think, be a representative of the particular organization concerned, and also, of course, a member of the Public Service Board, or a representative of it. In order to prevent further trouble with other Public Service organizations, there should be a representative of such organizations on the Board, for we do not want a repetition of the conditions arising out of the seamen's dispute. In that case, as the result of an award by the Court, the seamen were for a time actually receiving higher pay than their senior officers. We are a progressive community, and there is no doubt that between the demands of the employees and concessions given by employers, the unfortunate public has of late years been very badly squeezed; so I suggest in addition the appointment to the Board of a representative of the

middle classes, the people who "get it in the neck" every time. This may perhaps, appear to be a clumsy arrangement, but I think it would prove effective. I do not suggest that the various representatives on the Board should be the same in every case. The procedure of the Wages Board system could be adhered to, the associated members being nominated from time to time, and, when necessary, resigning and being replaced by others directly interested in a particular dispute.

The Public Service is a huge organization. I am afraid one Arbitrator will not be able to deal satisfactorily with the large number of problems that will come before him, and that before long he will be as much encumbered with arrears of work as the Arbitration Court is. I suggest, therefore, that the Arbitrator should have power to delegate certain disputes to, say, a stipendiary magistrate, who should be assisted by assessors, and in order to obviate diverging judgments, any awards made by the deputy tribunal could be subject to review by the Arbitrator or Chairman of the proposed Board. In this way I see a possibility of giving the representatives of the various organizations a chance to meet the administrative officers, as members of a Board, and arrive at a satisfactory decision in regard to any dispute. I am entirely opposed to the suggestion that the employees' representatives should be associated in any way with the Board of Management. That would certainly lead to disaster. It has been said that it would be a pity to appoint a separate Board for the Public Service, but I understand it is the intention of the Government to set up these tribunals in connexion with outside industrial disputes, and I think the Public Service is big enough to justify the appointment of a special Board. I would forbid members of any Public Service organization from being affiliated with an outside industrial body, because, as Mr. McLachlan has pointed out, this only leads to trouble, disloyalty in the Service, and inefficiency. We want to remedy this state of affairs.

I agree with the strictures passed by Senator Keating on the power proposed to be conferred upon the Arbitrator, who will be an absolute dictator, to be placed by this measure above every authority in

the community. The Minister will be well advised to revise drastically the clauses dealing with his powers.

Senator J. D. MILLEN (Tasmania) [4.45].—In the measure now under consideration there are several matters with which I do not agree. First of all, there is the question of arbitration. Up to the present the Arbitration Court has proved a failure, not in every instance, but in some very significant cases, notably, 'the coal miners' and the seamen's disputes. It has been our experience of late that when an award does not suit the organization concerned, it is simply turned down, and direct action is resorted to. What will be the position if the Arbitrator's decisions give rise to dissatisfaction? Shall we be faced with the same position as the Government of Western Australia? Or shall we be in the same position as we were during the coal-miners' strike, when it appeared as if the Judge had been instructed to give the men what they wanted? If members of the Public Service become sufficiently strong and united and object to an award, will the Government then give them what they demand?

Senator PEARCE.—I remind the honorable senator that in Western Australia the civil servants have no recourse to the Arbitration Court.

Senator J. D. MILLEN.—It is not a question of recourse to the Arbitration Court at all. The question is: If members of the Civil Service are not satisfied with an award, will they then resort to direct action, which appears to be a very prevalent disease just now? If they do, we shall be in a very serious position.

Senator PEARCE.—We all recognise that, but how are we going to deal with it?

Senator J. D. MILLEN.—It seems to me that we are rushing on with this proposal to appoint an Arbitrator and to make some drastic alterations in our Arbitration Act. It might be well to remember that the British Government have concluded that arbitration is an unsatisfactory method of dealing with disputes, and have decided upon the Whitley councils system. The Government might be well advised to adopt the same course here. A considerable amount of money has been expended upon Mr.

McLachlan's report, and we are entitled to get at all the facts upon which his determination has been based. Personally I am opposed to the Bill.

Senator PEARCE (Western Australia—Minister for Defence) [4.48].—I should like at the outset to express my appreciation of the interesting speeches delivered by those honorable senators who have made their *debüt* on this and the other Bill, and I particularly congratulate them on their brevity. They have set older members of the Senate an example which we would do well to follow.

Coming now to the criticism of the Bill, I remind Senator Senior that there is a minimum fixed in relation to the number of members who may form an organization, for it is provided that not less than three-fifths the number engaged in any particular branch of the Public Service must be members of an organization that seeks registration, and there is a reason, beyond that given by Senator Duncan, for this minimum. He pointed out that the inherent right of men to justice is not limited by their numbers. But there is another and very important reason. Administrative officers sometimes become members of an organization, and on certain occasions they have been called upon to answer to their union for having done their duty as officials of the Public Service. That is not right, as they are there to guard the interests of the Government, and must be free from interference of any kind. Under this provision it will be possible for certain officers to form an organization of their own, and have their cases considered. They will be able to be loyal to the Government, and not subjected to any undue influence in the performance of their duty; that is why the clause is very necessary. Senator J. D. Millen referred to the strike of civil servants in Western Australia, where every civil servant, including the heads of Departments, were compelled to come out on strike because they were all members of the one organization. The result has been that the Government activities in Western Australia have been practically at a standstill.

Senator Senior pleaded for the payment of costs by the Government; but he must remember that the members of the Service, after submitting their case to the

Board of Management, have the right to appeal to the Arbitrator. Senator SENIOR says that the Government, which is the representative of the taxpayer, should pay their costs, but in this case it is the taxpayer who is really the employer.

Senator SENIOR.—Supposing the representatives of the Service have to travel from Queensland or from Western Australia?

Senator PEARCE.—I will deal with that point later, and prove conclusively that in such cases it is highly desirable that the costs should not be paid. The taxpayer is represented by the Board of Management, the members of which may state that they are prepared to award a certain rate of wages, and the employees, through their organization, say they are not satisfied with the rate fixed. The Commonwealth, through its Parliament, says that there is an Arbitration Court to which they can submit their cases, and the taxpayers engage an official to represent them. The representatives of the Government have to be paid by the taxpayers, and it is equally right that the employees, through their organization, should pay their representative. The representative of the employees does not attend the Court to safeguard the rights of the taxpayers, but to fight for the interests of the section of public servants he represents. Why should the Public Service be placed in an advantageous position in this respect? If an organization of miners wishes to defend a case in the Arbitration Court, it has to pay its representatives, and there is no valid reason why the Public Service should be advantageously situated. I can easily imagine what glorified picnics there would be if Senator SENIOR's suggestion were adopted. The honorable senator referred, by interjection, to representatives having to travel from Queensland or Western Australia, and I venture to say that if the costs of such representatives were to be met by the Government it would be found that we would be likely to require the services of probably a dozen arbitrators instead of one. Is it to be said that this measure will be the means of denying substantial justice to members of the Civil Service?

Senator SENIOR.—Absolutely.

Senator PEARCE.—Senator SENIOR knows perfectly that when a case comes before the Court the advantage is not with the Government but with the Public Service. Let us consider the position as it

exists to-day. In every case when the Government are fighting before the Court the representatives of the Public Service are hoping that the Government will lose, because they realize that if they do it will be to their benefit. When dealing with the wages of, say, linemen, or even the salaries of men holding important positions in the administrative branch, it is always in the interests of the employees if the Government lose. I ask Senator SENIOR if, in his anxiety to protect the members of the Civil Service, he has considered the position of the Government as the representative of the taxpayers.

Senator SENIOR.—The taxpayer indirectly pays for the Government to be represented.

Senator PEARCE.—Of course he does; but the public servant in Arbitration Court cases has a tremendous advantage over the Government. Senator SENIOR pleaded for a contented and efficient service, and although that is very desirable, I am sure no one desires that we should have a pampered service.

The honorable senator also said that further time should be allowed for the consideration of the Bill, and that honorable senators should have the opportunity of perusing Mr. McLachlan's report before the measure was allowed to leave this Chamber. The Government introduced the Bill at this stage because there is considerable congestion of business in the Arbitration Court, and as many of the cases awaiting a hearing relate to the Public Service, the Government felt that the sooner the Bill was disposed of the better it would be, not only for the members of the Service but for the public generally. Mr. McLachlan's report shows clearly that he is totally opposed to arbitration, and, therefore, honorable senators would gain little information in regard to the details of arbitration if they had the report before them. If there is any doubt in the minds of honorable senators as to whether we should have a special Arbitration Court to deal with Public Service cases, the reference to arbitration in the report might lead honorable senators to oppose the Bill.

Senator THOMAS.—After perusing the report, some may be influenced to vote against the Bill.

Senator PEARCE.—I doubt very much whether any honorable senator

would be prepared to take the responsibility of dispensing with arbitration altogether. I do not think we have any direct actionists with us.

Senator FOLL.—I intend to oppose the Bill.

Senator PEARCE.—Is the honorable senator opposed to arbitration?

Senator FOLL.—Certainly not.

Senator PEARCE.—The Bill does not embody any new principle, and is practically a reprint of a measure that has been in operation since 1911. The only difference is that instead of having a Judge of the High Court to deal with Public Service cases, an Arbitrator; who need not necessarily be a Judge, is to be appointed. In view of these circumstances, it will be admitted that all the imaginary terrors and disabilities that have been brought forward by Senator Keating and others have been in the existing Act since 1911, and have not caused any trouble.

Senator Senior also drew attention to the fact that the awards of the Court will not be operative until they have been laid before Parliament for a period of thirty days. The honorable senator is of the opinion that they should become operative from the date on which they are made, and suggests that inconvenience will arise if Parliament should not be sitting when an award is made. There is a fundamental objection to the suggestion, as Parliament does and should retain control of all expenditure. Parliament will not concede what is asked, because it is well known that increases in salaries have to be brought forward on the Estimates and agreed to by Parliament before they are adopted.

Senator SENIOR. — That is not a parallel case.

Senator PEARCE.—If it is not a parallel case, there is great similarity. Are we going to give to an Arbitrator, who is not responsible to Parliament, except that he can be removed by petition, the power that should be retained by Parliament? When the Estimates are submitted to Parliament the expenditure and revenue should balance; and if we are not to have control over expenditure, it is more than probable that the Estimates of the Treasurer would be blown to pieces by the awards of the Court. Do

honorable senators realize that during the last financial year an amount of £750,000 was added to the Public Service wages bill by the awards of the Arbitration Court? That latent power must remain with Parliament, and, after all, is there much in the honorable senator's suggestion? I only wish, from one point of view, that Parliament was not in session as frequently as it is. My experience has been that Parliament sits for the greater part of the year, and our recesses are marked by their brevity. Even during the war, when we were fighting for our life, Parliament sat for nine months out of twelve, and it is very unlikely that inconvenience would be caused to members of the Service because Parliament was not in session.

Senator Thomas referred to the question of temporary employees, and to the position that might arise in the event of an award of the proposed Court clashing with an existing award. An award given by the Arbitrator who is to be appointed will certainly bind a member of a Public Service organization, and the wages he will be paid will be the wages awarded by the Arbitrator. If the Arbitrator is a man of common sense, he will, before giving his decision, have before him the awards of the general Arbitration Court.

Senator THOMAS. — Supposing the Arbitrator made one award, and the general Arbitration Court made another?

Senator PEARCE.—Senator Thomas must admit that it is not always the Government that must be accommodating. Surely the unions must shoulder some responsibility. Why should the Government always have to concede a higher rate? If a lower award is made outside there is never a demand made by the Public Service that such an award should apply to it. If the contention is that awards in the Public Service must be the same as those outside, it will be time for the country, through Parliament, to say that the conditions shall be the same. As a matter of fact, we know that they are not. There are sick pay, sick leave, furlough, recreation, and a great many advantages enjoyed by public servants that are not enjoyed by employees outside the Service. All these advantages have a monetary

value to the recipient of them and should be taken into consideration.

Senator FOLL.—Are they not taken into consideration by the Judge of the Arbitration Court now?

Senator PEARCE.—I do not think that they are. They should be taken into consideration by a Public Service organization where, in the case referred to by Senator Thomas, there is a difference between an award of the General Arbitration Court and an award of the Public Service Arbitration Court.

Senator Thomas and one or two other honorable senators spoke of the necessity of appointing assessors to assist the Arbitrator, and regret has been expressed at the omission from this Bill of any provision for a conference or something in the shape of a Whitley council. If honorable senators will turn to sub-clause 5 of clause 12 of the Bill, they will find that what they ask is provided for, though perhaps not as directly as some might wish. After a plaint has been lodged or served on the Minister or Department, the sub-clause to which I refer provides that—

If any objection is lodged the Arbitrator shall call a conference, to be presided over by himself, of representatives of the organization and of the Commissioner and of any Minister who has lodged objection to the granting of the claim, and following upon such conference shall, after hearing such evidence (if any) in respect of such matter as has not been agreed to at the conference, as the Arbitrator thinks necessary, determine the claim.

That is practically a power to call the conference that is asked for, and meets the same purpose as a Whitley council or round-table conference.

Senator THOMAS.—I take it that the organization concerned will discuss the matter in dispute with the Board of Management first of all.

Senator PEARCE.—That is so, but if the organization objects to what is decided by the Board and appeals to the Arbitrator he can convene a conference under the sub-clause to which I have referred. There are other provisions in the Bill under which the Arbitrator is not bound by the strict rules of evidence, or technicalities, and can inform himself in any way he thinks fit.

Senator SENIOR.—And he can shut out any evidence he pleases.

Senator PEARCE.—The Arbitrator may, under this Bill, avail himself of the

suggestion offered by Senator Elliott. It may be that a dispute arises in a remote part of the Commonwealth, or is peculiar to one State of the Commonwealth, and the Arbitrator may appoint a Board representing himself and the disputants to go into the matter in dispute and report to him. He may inform his mind in any way he thinks desirable in connexion with any matter in dispute.

Senator FOLL.—He is the person who gives the decision whether a conference is called or not.

Senator PEARCE.—Of course he is. There must be some final authority. The convening of a conference does not necessarily mean that it will come to a decision. It may represent two views, and there must be some one to arbitrate between them. If the conference came to a unanimous decision it is almost certain that the Arbitrator would accept that as his determination. It is only in case of failure to agree when the matter is first submitted to him that the Arbitrator would be likely to call a conference.

Senator Keating was, I think, unduly alarmed in regard to the powers given under clause 16. First of all, in replying to the honorable senator, I have to say that there is nothing new about clause 16. It is a repetition of the exact wording of section 10 of the Arbitration (Public Service) Act, which has been in force since 1911. To the legal mind of Senator Keating there may be some consolation in the fact that a Judge has been administering section 10 of the Arbitration (Public Service) Act whilst this Bill might be administered by some one who is not a Judge. Personally, I am as ready to trust a layman to act with common sense in the settlement of matters of this kind as I am to trust a Judge to do so. The powers conferred by clause 16, therefore, have been administered for some time under the existing law, and, so far as I know, they have never been abused. It may be said that even if that be so, there has been a right of appeal, and there is no appeal under the Public Service Act. There is no appeal under the Act to which I have referred from the Public Service Arbitration Court to any other Court, and yet the clause to which Senator Keating objects is, as I have said, an exact duplicate of a section of that Act. We have the experience of the operation of that section since

1911, and none of the terrible forebodings of Senator Keating have been realized. There is a distinct necessity for such a clause. The Public Service Association may dispute certain decisions of the Board of Management in respect to wages, conditions of labour, or service; and when the Arbitrator comes to deal with the complaint he may find that if he confines his decision to the matters referred to him, the result may be only to create the confusion and chaos already referred to as arising from conflicting or differing awards. If the Arbitrator fixes the wages of a linesman, it may be that he will feel it necessary that he should also fix the number of linesmen who should be employed for a given length of line. Honorable senators will see that there may be a number of things conditional or contingent upon the fixing of the wages of a particular section of the Public Service. The purpose of the clause objected to is to enable the Arbitrator to avoid being restricted to the consideration merely of the items in a plaint where, in order that he may do justice, he should consider all matters pertaining thereto, even though some of them are not strictly included in the reference to him.

Senator FOSTER.—What is the position of the Board of Management in that case?

Senator PEARCE.—Exactly the same as the position of the Public Service Commissioner under the existing law. The Board of Management will have the power to initiate the rates of wages, salaries, and conditions of the Service—

Senator THOMAS.—In the same way as the managers of a mine fix wages and conditions which may afterwards be reviewed by the Arbitration Court?

Senator PEARCE.—In just the same way. The managers of a mine may decide that the wages of miners shall be fixed at a certain rate. The men may not accept their decision, and may take the matter to the Arbitration Court, and then the Judge of the Arbitration Court fixes how much shall be paid. Honorable senators need not be alarmed concerning the consequences of passing clause 16. It is a very necessary clause, giving the Arbitrator power to consider all matters incidental to the plaint referred to him.

On the question of control over the Arbitrator, let me say that, just as under

the Arbitration (Public Service) Act there was no provision for an appeal from the Public Service Arbitration Court, there is no appeal provided for here. But there is still the control of Parliament. That is to say, that the judgment of the Arbitrator must be laid on the table in both Houses of this Parliament; and if it is believed that it is not in the public interest, action can be taken to ask Parliament to disallow the award. That is the appeal that is provided for.

Senator SENIOR.—That is one-sided.

Senator PEARCE.—It is not any more one-sided than would be an appeal from the judgment of the Arbitrator to another Court. After all, we are constantly told that Parliament is the highest Court in the land.

Senator THOMAS.—There is the same provision under the existing law.

Senator PEARCE.—Yes, and it has never been operative. It has never been suggested that any award made should be disallowed. The power of disallowance is latent, and it is a sufficient guarantee that the horrible consequences suggested by Senator Keating as likely to follow the investment of the Arbitrator with this unlimited power is really not likely to arise. What is the alternative? Senator Keating suggests an appeal to the Law Courts. My experience of industrial laws, which I am sure will be borne out by honorable senators who have had much to do with industrial matters, is that every time there is an industrial dispute the disputants to go to the ultimate Court open to them. If, under this Bill, organizations of the Public Service were given the right to appeal from a decision of the arbitrator to the Law Courts, we may depend upon it that every Public Service case would be settled in the Court of last resort. This could only have the effect of making a settlement more costly, difficult, and irritating to every one concerned.

Senator KEATING.—I did not suggest appeals, but finality.

Senator PEARCE.—There is finality provided for in the Bill.

Senator KEATING.—I object to the provision with regard to prohibition.

Senator PEARCE.—We say that the only way in which we can secure finality is to prohibit appeals to the Law Courts.

The right of revision rests with this Parliament if it should be necessary to exercise it.

Senator Duncan mentioned a very contentious matter in referring to the segregation of Public Service employees. That is a question which becomes more difficult as time goes on. In the old days, when a Government was simply a machine for carrying on the ordinary government of the country, the difficulty did not arise; but to-day, in carrying out various functions, the Government invade almost every walk of life. It engages in various industries, in commercial occupations, shipping, and so on. The difficulty now is to draw the line and say what are actually governmental services, and what are commercial or industrial undertakings. I believe that this Bill does that completely. For instance, the Commonwealth Government to-day undertakes shipbuilding, shipping, the manufacture of woollen cloth and of uniforms for its servants, and so on. None of these are really governmental undertakings that will come within the scope of the Public Service Arbitrator provided for in this Bill. Those concerned in such undertakings will have their remedy in the ordinary Arbitration Court. On the other hand, the Attorney-General's Department, the Prime Minister's Department, and the Home and Territories Department are institutions necessary to carry on the ordinary government of the country, and the employees of those Departments can be segregated from the employees of other Departments that may not be carrying out purely functions of government. If this were not possible, we might have governmental machinery linked up with some industrial dispute that had nothing whatever to do with the government of the country, but had to do with a question of the distribution of profits between employer and employee. Surely that would not be desirable. The only way to avoid that is to provide that services established for carrying on the government of the country should be segregated from the industrial life, which is concerned with the question of the distribution of profit between employer and employee.

Senator DRAKE-BROCKMAN.—Where is that made clear in the Bill?

Senator Pearce.

Senator PEARCE.—That is made clear by the clauses which make provision as to the Departments which will come under this measure—that is to say, those which are governed by the Public Service Act. The employees engaged in the industries I have mentioned, and in connexion with the railways of the Commonwealth, are not subject to the Public Service Act.

Senator LYNCH.—Higher wages obtaining for the same class of work inside or outside the Public Service has been a constant source of trouble.

Senator PEARCE.—That is so. I have said that the Arbitrator will have before him the awards applying to persons employed outside the Service, and will, no doubt, consider them in making up his mind as to the decision at which he should arrive.

Senator DRAKE-BROCKMAN.—According to the definition clause, the Bill applies to certain services “whether under the Commonwealth Public Service Act 1902-1918 or not.”

Senator PEARCE.—The honorable senator will see that in the definition clause “the Public Service” is defined to include—

The Public Service of the Northern Territory and of the territory for the Seat of Government, and the service of any public institution or authority of the Commonwealth, and includes all persons employed in any such service in any capacity, whether permanently or temporarily, and whether under the Commonwealth Public Service Act 1902-1918 or not, but does not include persons employed in the Naval or Military Forces only.

Senator DRAKE-BROCKMAN.—That does not exclude anybody.

Senator PEARCE.—No.

Senator THOMAS.—It does not exclude the men who are engaged in the Commonwealth woollen mills.

Senator PEARCE.—There is another clause dealing with that matter.

Senator SENIOR.—There is only one exemption—that of the members of the Naval and Military Forces of the Commonwealth.

Senator PEARCE.—Honorable senators will note that clause 4 provides that—

Employees in the Public Service, or in any division, class, grade, or branch thereof, or in any calling, service, handicraft, occupation, or avocation in the Public Service, or in any division, class, grade, or branch thereof, shall be deemed to be employees in an industry within the meaning of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904-1918.

However, I am advised that the industries to which I have referred do not come within that category. I have had experience of the working of the Act, and I know that, by agreement with the Minister, those industries can be brought within its scope. As a matter of fact, in some cases in my own Department that has been done. However, I cannot very well deal with everything on the spur of the moment, but in Committee, I shall be able to satisfy honorable senators on that point.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee:

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to:

Clause 3—

3. In this Act unless the contrary intention appears—

"The Public Service" includes the Public Service of the Northern Territory and of the Territory for the Seat of Government, and the service of any public institution or authority of the Commonwealth, and includes all persons employed in any such service in any capacity, whether permanently or temporarily, and whether under the Commonwealth Public Service Act 1902-1918 or not, but does not include persons employed in the Naval or Military Forces only.

Senator SENIOR (South Australia) [5.24].—Notwithstanding the very indefinite references in this clause to the Public Service Act 1902-1918, I am inclined to think that the definition of "the Public Service" which is here laid down must not be read in conjunction with the definition which is contained in the principal Act. In that case the two definitions must stand separately, and under this clause "the Public Service" will include all persons employed by the Commonwealth with the exception of members of the Naval and Military Forces. The provision is so very comprehensive that we ought to know exactly where is the boundary fence.

Senator BENNY.—Will the honorable senator look at clause 4, which defines an industry within the meaning of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act?

Senator SENIOR.—The provision which we are now considering is a definition clause, and clause 4 deals with an entirely different subject. From the definition which is laid down in this clause, I imagine that the Court would hold that all employees of the Commonwealth, with the exception of members of the Naval

and Military Forces, are included in the Commonwealth Public Service.

Senator KEATING (Tasmania) [5.27].—I think that the definition of "The Public Service" which is contained in this clause is very much wider and more comprehensive than was indicated by the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) in his concluding remarks upon the motion for the second reading of the Bill. That definition is identical with the definition which is contained in the Arbitration (Public Service) Act 1911, and which was intended, I think, to apply the principle of arbitration in the relation of employer and employee, to the Commonwealth and all persons working for it, irrespective of whether or not they were covered by the Public Service Act 1902-1918. Of recent years, and particularly since 1911, the Commonwealth has extended its activities in many directions, so that to-day it has numerous employees in occupations which were never dreamed of in that year. As the Arbitration (Public Service) Act of 1911 will not remain in force when this Bill becomes law, it necessarily follows that these employees will come under this measure. Clause 4 is intended to meet a difficulty which arose in the Arbitration Court within the past twelve or eighteen months.

Senator PEARCE.—That provision is contained in the Arbitration (Public Service) Act 1911.

Senator KEATING.—That is so. But the difficulty to which I refer arose within the past twelve or eighteen months. It has been emphasised that the power of the Commonwealth to settle industrial disputes by means of conciliation and arbitration applies only to disputes extending beyond the limits of any one State. But the argument to which I am now referring relates chiefly to the question of industrial disputes. Quite recently an appeal to the High Court was made by various municipalities against an award of the Arbitration Court, on the ground that their officers were not engaged in industries. A similar question arose in connexion with the plaint of the Australian Journalists Association. When that plaint came before the Arbitration Court it was argued on behalf of the respondents that journalism was not an industry, and that therefore it could not be the subject of legislation for the settlement of industrial disputes by means of conciliation

and arbitration. It will be seen, therefore, that upon the definition which is contained in the clause now under review will depend what employees should be included within the scope of this Bill. I agree with Senator Senior that under this definition the only employees of the Commonwealth who will be excluded from the scope of the measure will be members of the Naval and Military Forces of the Commonwealth.

Senator FOLL (Queensland) [5.31].—A perusal of this clause will, I think, convince honorable senators that practically every Commonwealth employee will come within the purview of the Bill. It follows, therefore, that the employees of the Repatriation Department, which is administered by its own Board of Commissioners, will have the right of appeal from that Board to the Public Service Arbitrator.

Senator PEARCE (Western Australia—Minister for Defence) [5.32].—As the points which have been raised in connexion with clauses 3 and 4 ought to be cleared up before we proceed further, I move—

That clauses 3 and 4 be postponed.

Motion agreed to.

Clause 5—

An association of less than one hundred employees in an industry in the Public Service may be registered under the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904-1918 as an organization, if its membership comprises at least three-fifths of all the persons who are employees in that industry in the Public Service.

Senator SENIOR (South Australia) [5.33].—The argument which has been advanced by the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) in respect of this clause is a very general one. He has affirmed that we should not deny justice, even to the smallest number of individuals engaged in any calling. That fact is generally admitted. My own view is that we ought not to deny justice to a single individual. However, the Arbitration Court has specifically decided that one individual cannot lodge a plaint with it. Only a union can do that. Upon the motion for the second reading of this Bill I pointed out that the clause now under consideration must have the effect of breaking up the Public Service organizations into small isolated camps. The Minister has affirmed that that is all right. But my argument is that we must aim at cohesion rather than at distribution.

Senator HENDERSON.—There is a number of unions in the Public Service now.

Senator SENIOR.—That is so. Attention was called to this matter by the Minister for Defence, who pointed out that some of those unions include as members persons who are outside, as well as inside, the Service. In the Postal Department there are engineers who belong to unions with members also outside the Service. The Government propose to break off that portion of the union which is inside the Service and place it in a separate compartment. The same thing will apply to electricians and dozens of other artisans. The result will be constant unrest, because if a different award is given to those outside the Service, those inside will apply for another hearing, and *vice versa*. I object to the clause, because it will tend to break up the unions, and in each case two awards will have to be made to accomplish what is now done by one. The proposal will not benefit the unions or the Service as a whole, but will lead to discontent.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 6 (Arbitrator).

Senator FOSTER (Tasmania) [5.38].

—I should like from the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) some indication of the position the Arbitrator will occupy in relation to the Board of Management, particularly in the matter of salary. I am anxious to see the proposed Board of Management composed of the very best men that we can get for the job. As Senator Thomas said yesterday, it was at one time suggested to him that he should get the very best man available to put the affairs of the Post Office in order, and I take it that we want the very best business men with properly-trained minds to manage the Public Service. The Arbitrator, if he should be a man appointed from the Public Service, should be at least equal in experience and merit with the men appointed to the Board. If he is to be paid a smaller salary than the members of the Board, the Board will be placed in an unfair position. We have had no indication from the Minister of the rates of salary to be paid to the members of the Board and the Arbitrator, and we are, therefore, in the dark as to what the position of the Arbitrator will be. To

allow the Arbitrator to have absolute authority to do practically as he likes with the recommendations or instructions of the Board of Management is to give too much power to one man. A man may be appointed as Arbitrator who has no idea of the value of evidence, yet he is to be given *carté blanche* to discard ordinary legal methods and to accept or reject evidence as he pleases. In that direction he is to be allowed to use more common sense than legal judgment. In view of the positions to be occupied by the Board of Management and the Arbitrator, who is to have power above the Board, we should have some indication of the type of men whom it is proposed to appoint.

Senator PEARCE (Western Australia)—Minister for Defence [5.40].—I have already said that the Government propose to pay a salary of at least £2,000 a year to the Arbitrator. That is a little more than it is proposed to pay to two members of the Board, and a little less than is to be paid to the chairman. I have not the exact figures with me. The Arbitrator will, therefore, occupy a fairly important position, but one not quite so important as was indicated by Senator Foster, because he will have nothing to do with a great deal of the Board's activities. He will deal only with such parts of the provisions as to salaries and wages as are appealed against by Public Service organizations. He is to be a court of appeal for the Board in those cases only, but the Board will deal with a great deal more than the fixation of salaries and conditions of employment. The position of Arbitrator should carry a salary sufficient to attract a man possessing the qualities that such a post calls for, and comparing favorably with the salaries paid to those, part of whose work he may have to revise. The Government will give due weight to all these considerations when they make the appointments. They are quite seized of their importance.

Senator EARLE.—Will the Minister say what the cost of the Board will be?

Senator PEARCE.—There will be other expenses besides salaries in connexion with the Board of Management; but I am not in a position to say what the total expenses of the Arbitrator will be.

Senator FOLL (Queensland) [5.43].—As the discussion progresses, and after listening attentively to the reply of the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) to the second-reading debate, I am more than ever convinced that the Bill will lead to endless confusion in the Public Service. Consequently, I intend to vote against the clause. Its defeat would practically mean the rejection of the Bill. We have, on the one hand, a Board of Management to be appointed by the Government to control the Public Service in a business-like manner, and yet practically the whole power to control the Service is to be taken out of their hands and placed in the hands of the Arbitrator. This simply means that it will be impossible for the Board to do satisfactory work for the country.

Senator EARLE.—To the same extent power is taken out of the hands of all employers by our present system of arbitration.

Senator FOLL.—I do not agree with the honorable senator. The proposed Arbitrator is to be an appointee of the Government, and clause 16 gives him unlimited power to do whatever he likes so far as the Public Service is concerned. There will be nothing, so far as working conditions go, that he will not have power to deal with.

Senator ROWELL.—He will have no more power than the Arbitration Court Judges have now.

Senator FOLL.—I am not dealing with the question of arbitration generally.

Senator PEARCE.—If you are fair, you should do so.

Senator FOLL.—I will be fair. I tell the Minister candidly that during recent years, at any rate, it is doubtful whether arbitration has been such a great asset to the country as some honorable senators think. I could quote some of the doings of the Arbitration Court in Queensland that would show clearly that the Court has not been altogether of advantage to that State. I intend to vote against the clause, because I desire to see the Public Service placed on a business-like basis, and the gentlemen to be appointed to the Board of Management given a fair opportunity to carry out the wishes of Parliament.

Senator J. D. MILLEN (Tasmania) [5.46].—I also listened with a great deal of care to the Minister's statement. One

thing that struck me was his assertion that if Senator Keating's suggestion were adopted, and a Court to review the Arbitrator's decisions created, it would tend to make every decision given by the Arbitrator end in the Court of law. The same argument applies to this case. Every decision arrived at by the Board of Management, which is in opposition to the desires of any of the men, will be forced before the Arbitrator. I am opposed to the clause.

Question—That the clause be agreed to—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes	20
Noes	4
Majority	16

AYES.

Bakhap, T. J. K.	Lynch, P. J.
Benny, B.	Payne, H. J. M.
Buzacott, R.	Pearce, G. F.
Drake-Brockman, E. A.	Plain, W.
Duncan, W. L.	Rowell, J.
Earle, J.	Russell, E. J.
Elliott, H. E.	Senior, W.
Fairbairn, G.	Thomas, J.
Guthrie, J. F.	
Henderson, G.	
Keating, J. H.	

Teller:
de Largie, H.

NOES.

Foster, G. M.	Teller:
Millen, J. D.	Foll, H. S.
Wilson, R. V.	

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 11 agreed to.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT.

AUSTRALIAN IMPERIAL FORCE: BAND INSTRUMENTS—WAR GRATUITY BONDS: INSURANCE AGENTS' COMMISSION: PURCHASES OF FURNITURE—PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS.

Motion (by Senator PEARCE) proposed—That the Senate do now adjourn.

Senator ROWELL (South Australia) [5.52].—I wish to bring under the notice of the Minister for Defence (Senator Pearce) the position with regard to band instruments donated to members of the Australian Imperial Force when in training prior to their departure during the war. While I was Acting Commandant for South Australia, a lady offered to supply a full set of band instruments for the use of the men. I accepted the offer on the understanding that the instruments were not to be taken out of Australia, and that, after the war, they were

to be retained on behalf of the men. I am not quite sure what conditions governed the gift, but I believe that the lady paid about £150 for the instruments, which I understand are now in the Ordnance Stores in Adelaide. Probably the position is very much the same in the other States. Recently the South Australian Returned Soldiers' Association, which has a membership of over 20,000 men, decided to form a band, and they made application to the Commandant for the use of these instruments. The Commandant was sympathetic, but, of course, had to refer the request to Head-quarters, which turned it down. I have a copy of the correspondence that passed on this subject, and I appeal to the Minister to see if something cannot be done in the matter. If he cannot hand the instruments over to the Returned Soldiers' Band, I suggest that he might be able to allow them to be taken out on loan with some necessary safeguards. I understand also that the men made application for authority to use Australian Imperial Force uniform, but this request was, I think, quite properly refused.

Senator FOSTER (Tasmania) [5.55].

—The reply given to me by the Minister for Repatriation (Senator Millen) this afternoon concerning the cashing of gratuity bonds for life assurance policies did not quite cover my question. I asked if the Treasury had issued an order that no commission was to be paid to agents in cases where returned soldiers cashed their war gratuity bonds for life assurance, and if the Minister was aware that this policy would have the effect of penalizing many returned soldiers who had taken up life assurance work. The Minister's reply was—

Yes. The action was taken solely in the interests of bond owners. The Treasury endeavours to protect the soldier by seeing that he gets full value for his bonds. Where the soldier takes out a policy which he does not intend to renew, or which he cannot renew, because the annual premiums are too high, he is merely discounting his bond. This is undesirable, and cannot be allowed. To avoid trouble in this direction, the Treasury consulted the principal life assurance societies, and, after consideration of their views, decided that these transactions should be dealt with only by the executive officers of these societies.

I understand that if a returned soldier tenders his war gratuity bond to a life assurance company, the company will cash the bond for the full amount less four years' premium on an assurance policy.

and it appears to me that the action of the Treasury officials in ordering that no commission be allowed to agents who may secure this business for the company are not protecting the soldier at all. The companies get over the value of the discount on the bond at face value, because they have an investment which is worth 5½ per cent. to them, which is fairly good interest-earning paper, and they evade the commission which ordinarily they would have to pay to agents. In the ordinary course of business, a life assurance society pays an agent the full amount of commission agreed upon for new business, even if the premium be for one year only, and I contend that the action of the Treasury officials in this matter does not represent a fair deal to those returned soldiers who have taken up agency work for life assurance companies.

Senator FOLL (Queensland) [6.0].—I remind the Leader of the Senate (Senator Millen) that for several months now I have had a private notice of motion on the business-paper relating to the appointment of Trade Commissioners, and, so far, have not had an opportunity of getting a vote upon it. Although notices of motion by private members may not be regarded by the Government as of any particular importance, they are of interest to honorable senators, and I should like to know if my notice of motion is to be adjourned every Thursday, as has been the case up to the present, or whether the Minister will deign to favour me with a few minutes, in reply, on some Thursday evening in the not too-far distant future. I do not wish to cause the Minister unnecessary worry, because I know he is a busy man; but I do not think my request is an unreasonable one.

I also wish to bring under his notice certain transactions in connexion with the War Gratuity Bonds. I understand that if a returned soldier desires to buy furniture on the strength of a bond for £100, the furniture warehouseman, as a rule, requires him to buy furniture to the full value of the bond, although he might not require £100 worth of furniture. I believe a number of storekeepers and other business firms are acting in the same way. I am afraid it is too late now to do anything, but I think it would have been much better if the war gratuity bonds had been paid in denominations of £10 instead of one bond for the full amount of gratuity, so that if a soldier

desired to negotiate portion of his bond, say, for a suit of clothes, he would be able to do so; instead of being required to purchase material to the full value of his bond.

Senator E. D. MILLEN (New South Wales—Minister for Repatriation) [6.4].—I should like to deal first with the question raised by Senator Foll. I am quite aware of the practice to which the honorable gentleman refers; due, no doubt, to the desire of some rather foolish soldiers to get a measure of cash for their bonds by making purchases, which often they do not need, from certain unscrupulous traders. Unfortunately this is a matter for which at present I can suggest no remedy; but I shall bring it under the notice of the Treasurer (Sir Joseph Cook) with a suggestion that some arrangement might be made to *bonâ fide* cases of men desiring to convert portion of their bonds.

Senator Foll referred to the notice of motion standing in his name as to the appointment of Australian Trade Commissioners, and asked when an opportunity would be given for its further discussion. If the honorable senator will be patient and practice that great virtue, which I know he possesses, a little longer, I think I can see an opportunity within a reasonable time of the Government coming to a definite decision in the matter.

The question raised by Senator Foster regarding the restrictions on the cashing of gratuity bonds is one of the most difficult problems with which the Government have been confronted in their endeavour, not only to protect the soldiers against unscrupulous outsiders, but against themselves. Senator Foster—I am sure he will pardon me for saying so—has not revealed a very keen sense of proportion in this matter, as he has submitted the cases of a very small number of returned soldiers who are acting as canvassers for insurance companies, and places their interests against those of the main body.

Senator FOSTER.—But they have to be considered.

Senator E. D. MILLEN.—Certainly; but the number is small. It must be admitted that only a limited number of ex-soldiers are taking up this work, and by submitting alluring propositions are inducing bond holders to take out insurance policies which they would not otherwise

do merely to enable the canvassers to collect a commission. The restrictions have been placed upon these men to minimize the trouble, because we cannot remove it, and it is hoped that our efforts will prevent canvassers persuading ex-soldiers to take out policies when they do not desire to do so. I ask Senator Foster to accept my assurance that the Government have acted in this manner merely because they desire to protect the soldiers, and it is admitted that many do need protection. It has been brought under my notice that the practice to which I have referred has been going on, and it is difficult to know how it can be checked. The restrictions have been framed in the interests of the soldiers themselves, and, I submit, that it is our duty to abstain from placing any inducements in the way of men that are not entirely satisfactory to those concerned.

Senator PEARCE (Western Australia—Minister for Defence) [6.7].—The point raised by Senator Rowell has already been brought under my notice, as in practically every State in the Commonwealth patriotic citizens supplied band instruments for use in the various training camps. The men to whom these instruments were presented left Australia, and the Defence Department was, in a sense, a trustee of the instruments, and had to make the best use it could of them. At the time when action was taken it was thought that many ex-members of the Australian Imperial Force would be enrolled in an Army Reserve—some 40,000 were actually enrolled—and it was decided that the instruments should be kept for that body, because nobody could have a better claim on the instruments than the ex-Australian Imperial Force men. The present position is that the Government have not yet put the scheme into operation, and cannot do so until their defence policy has been settled. The Defence Department is very loath to part with the instruments, even on loan, because it knows how difficult it would be to have them returned. I have no doubt that if an Army Reserve, or any other such force is established, it will have associated with it bands consisting of ex-Australian Imperial Force men and members of the returned soldiers bands to whom the instruments would be issued. I will bear Senator Rowell's suggestion in mind, and if the scheme, to which I have referred,

is not adopted, the persons who would have the best claim to the instruments would be the returned soldiers who have organized bands throughout the Commonwealth.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Senate adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

House of Representatives.

Thursday, 29 July, 1920.

The CLERK reported the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. J. M. Chanter) took the chair at 2.31 p.m., and read prayers.

DEATH OF LADY JOHNSON.

SYMPATHY WITH MR. SPEAKER.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—It is with sincere and deep regret that I announce to honorable members that a telegram has been received from Mr. Speaker, containing the sad news that his wife has died, and that she was buried this morning. I am certain that every honorable member, on hearing this announcement, will have the deepest and most heartfelt sympathy with Mr. Speaker. No sadder or worse calamity could befall a man than the death of his wife. As Deputy Speaker, I tender to Sir Elliot my sincere regrets, and hope that he may have strength to bear up under the great blow that he has received.

MR. HUGHES.—On behalf of the Ministry and of honorable members generally, I offer to Mr. Speaker the deepest sympathy in his sad bereavement. Words are a poor thing to offer on occasions like this as balm for the deep wound of such sorrow. We realize that the loss which Sir Elliot has suffered is irreparable, and one for which no earthly consolation can be found, unless it be in the knowledge that his friends and his fellow-members sincerely sympathize with him, and trust that time may blunt the edge of his sharp grief. We deeply regret his loss, though we are glad that he was at least able to be with his wife at the end.

Mr. TUDOR.—Even had I not risen to speak on behalf of honorable members of the Labour party in support of what you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the Prime Minister have said, it would have been realized that we feel the most sincere and deepest sympathy with Mr. Speaker. On behalf of those who sit on the left of the gangway I express sincere regret for the great sorrow that has befallen him. Only those who have gone through the experience can know how deep such sorrow as his is.

Mr. McWILLIAMS.—On behalf of honorable members of the Country party, I express, too, the deepest sympathy with Mr. Speaker. Those of us who for so long a stretch of time enjoyed the acquaintance of Sir Elliot and Lady Johnson, and knew their attachment to each other, are aware how greatly the blow must be felt.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2) 1920-21.

Message recommending appropriation reported.

Referred to Committee of Supply.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

Message received from the Senate announcing that Senators Foll, Newland, and Plain had been appointed members of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Public Works.

WAR GRATUITY BONDS.

Mr. WEST.—Is it the intention of the Treasurer to accept war gratuity bonds for peace loan bonds of the same value?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—No. That would be an easy way of cancelling the bonds, but if we adopted it we should have to raise a further loan, because its adoption would mean that we should get less money from the loan about to be issued.

PUBLIC SERVICE ADMINISTRATION.

MR. McLACHLAN'S REPORT.

Mr. FENTON.—Yesterday the Prime Minister laid on the table Mr. McLachlan's report upon the Public Service, and the paper was ordered to be printed. Will the right honorable gentleman kindly expedite the printing of it, so that honor-

able members may obtain copies as soon as possible.

Mr. HUGHES.—I am under the impression that the report has been printed, and if sufficient copies are not already available, I shall see that enough are supplied.

CUSTOMS DUTIES AND FOREIGN EXCHANGES.

Mr. BRUCE.—I desire to ask the Minister for Trade and Customs—although I have previously interrogated the Prime Minister on the subject—a question referring to the method adopted by the Customs Department in collecting exchanges in foreign countries. I wish to know whether, in view of the appalling losses that have been faced by French, Belgian, and Italian manufacturers under the existing rule, we may look for a decision by the Cabinet, such decision having been promised by the Prime Minister?

Mr. GREENE.—Yes; I hope it will be possible before very long to announce the final decision in regard to the matter.

THE GALLERIES.

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC.

Mr. TUDOR.—I desire, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to ask you a question, without notice, in reference to the procedure adopted last night in preventing the admission to the galleries of persons who had received orders. Honorable members, perhaps, are aware—at any rate, metropolitan members are—that applications from members of the public for admission to this House are sometimes sent in to honorable members a week ahead, and we obtain them from the Clerk Assistant, or the Serjeant-at-Arms. These tickets are limited to two for each member for any particular sitting. Standing order 64 provides—

Every member may each day, by written orders, admit three strangers to the gallery.

That, of course, refers to the gallery upstairs, because standing order 63 provides—

The Speaker only shall have the privilege of admitting strangers into the portion of the chamber below the Bar. Senators shall have the privilege of admission there without orders.

I understand that the front seat, on one side of the lower gallery, is reserved for senators, and the front seat, on the other

side, for members of the Victorian State Parliament. Each member has the right to issue two tickets, but the holders of such tickets, last night, were refused admission. It was then impossible to raise the question to which I am now referring, though I have raised the point before, when you, sir, were in the chair in Committee, and Mr. Speaker was brought in. I also ask whether it would not have been possible to inform honorable members of the procedure it was intended to adopt. Personally, I am opposed to any such procedure. In any case, the lower, or Speaker's gallery, is too small, and even when crowded will not hold more than fifty persons, so that if a disturbance did take place the offenders could be dealt with. On the only occasion when a disturbance happened, the whole of the top gallery was cleared, because of the conduct of two or three amongst the visitors. I should like to know why both of the galleries were kept clear last night, and why honorable members were not informed that it was intended to keep them clear. Why was this done, and on whose authority?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—Is the honorable member raising a question of privilege?

MR. TUDOR.—No, sir; I am merely asking a question regarding a privilege of honorable members of the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The honorable member informed me of the question he intended to submit to me as Deputy Speaker, as to who was responsible for the public with members' orders being prevented from entering the galleries last night. The honorable member has referred to standing order 64, which provides that every member may each day, by written order, admit three strangers to the gallery. This is one of the Standing Orders which is very indefinite, and can be interpreted in many ways. It sets out that admission is by written order, but the practice of this, and every other Parliament with which I have been associated, has been that these orders are issued by Mr. Speaker. Entrance to this House is entirely under the control of Mr. Speaker, and that standing order refers to not only what is known as the Speaker's gallery, but also the gallery upstairs. I be-

lieve that, for some periods in the past, it was possible for visitors to enter the upstairs gallery without any cards; but the practice of Mr. Speaker and his predecessors has been to issue tickets. I find that in the House of Commons admission to the gallery is entirely under the control of the Speaker's Secretary and the Sergeant-at-Arms—that is, in regard to the gallery which corresponds to our upper gallery—the lower gallery being reserved for the special control of Mr. Speaker. Certain proceedings with which I have no desire to deal at any length made it imperative on Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, who are the custodians of this building, and all within its precincts, to take extreme measures last night, in order to prevent the conduct of the business of this House being interfered with. I regret to say that on a previous occasion, which will be within the memory of some honorable members, people gathered outside this House, and, inflamed with certain feelings, forced their way, notwithstanding the few police who were here for our protection, through the vestibule into the Queen's Hall, and very nearly into the chamber itself. Certain indications and information given to the Government, Mr. President, and myself pointed to the probability of a very large concourse of people outside the building last night; and, if the measures then taken had been neglected, it would have been quite possible for numbers of those people to force their way, possibly into the Chamber, and behave in an unseemly way, that would have been derogatory to the Parliament. In consultation with Mr. President, it was arranged that, in the interests of the members themselves, means of protection should be adopted. Had the friends of honorable members been admitted in the usual way, they might, in the event of an influx of the crowd, have been maltreated, and it was therefore thought better that only honorable members themselves should be admitted. That course was followed, in view of what has taken place quite recently, and, as I say, in the interests of honorable members themselves, in order to conserve the peace and dignity of the Parliament. The proper officer, the Sergeant-at-Arms, was instructed to see that the order given was carried out—to see that, while there was any probability of a disturbance

outside, all strangers should be excluded. It was hoped that possibly about 9 o'clock the people might disperse, when the friends of honorable members could be admitted; but that did not prove to be the case. I take the responsibility for acting in the absence of Mr. Speaker, and it was painful for me to agree to the order given, but it was absolutely imperative.

Mr. TUDOR.—But why were not honorable members informed that it was intended to issue the order? All we knew of it we heard from people outside, and I spoke to the Serjeant-at-Arms regarding the matter after hearing a rumour from another honorable member. You, sir, must have known before 6.30 last night that such an order was to be issued.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—So far as I knew, honorable members would be so informed, because the usual practice is for them to apply to the Serjeant-at-Arms for tickets. Just very recently I remind the honorable member, Mr. Speaker issued to every honorable member a circular dealing with this question, and asking honorable members to be exceedingly careful in the future as to the persons they admit to the House. The only information that could be given last night in regard to the decision to exclude all visitors was made available through the ordinary channel; that is to say, when an application was made to the Serjeant-at-Arms for tickets to admit visitors, the applicant was informed of what had been done. In some cases honorable members came to me. The honorable member for West Sydney (Mr. Ryan) asked me if the instruction issued was a general order. I informed him that it was. Even my own daughters were excluded. Some honorable members had arranged to bring a number of school children to the House. They also had to be excluded. Altogether it was a very painful piece of business, and I am sure honorable members, if they regard it in the right light, will see that what was done by me, acting in conjunction with Mr. President, had but one object, and that was to preserve that dignity and decorum of the Chamber to which we have been accustomed in the past, and which I hope will be continued in the future.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Are we to understand that it lies within the discretion of Mr. Speaker or Mr. Deputy Speaker to

enforce the Standing Orders as they see fit; or are they to be enforced impartially according to the manner in which the position is viewed by Mr. Speaker or Mr. Deputy Speaker?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Apart from the right of any honorable member to call attention to the presence of strangers, it has been the practice in the past, and is so set forth in the Standing Orders, that Mr. Speaker himself, when he deems it necessary, may have strangers removed. On his own initiative he may order the removal of any number of persons or all of them. He is responsible for the conduct of the House. What was done last night was done in accordance with precedent, and with only one object in view. In the absence of Mr. Speaker, I ask every honorable member in his own interests, as well as in the interest of Parliament as a whole, to observe the new instructions recently issued by Mr. Speaker for the officers of the House to carry out.

COAL SHORTAGE.

Mr. BLUNDELL.—I understand that representations have been made by the South Australian Government in regard to the serious shortage of coal which threatens to affect the industrial welfare of the State very materially. Can the Prime Minister say whether anything can be done to relieve the position?

Mr. HUGHES.—At the Premiers' Conference the other day complaints were made by the Premiers of Victoria, South Australia, and other States, to the effect that there was a very great shortage of coal, which was attributed to three causes, the scarcity of shipping, the growth of the export trade, and the very frequent and serious stoppages of the men at different mines. I do not propose to apportion to each of these three causes its due and proper weight, but merely repeat what has been said. It is obvious that in discussing any shortage which may be due to industrial unrest, we are considering one particular phase of a general world-wide problem; and the shortage of shipping may also be said to be a phase of a problem similar in extent, but in reference to the export of coal overseas we are dealing with a condition of affairs

which has been created by the war, a most extraordinary position which has enabled Australia to sell coal to European countries at a lower rate than that charged for British coal. Coal goes where it can get the highest return. Obviously, that is the principle which guides men in all their actions, whether they be miners or mine-owners, and the only step the Commonwealth Government could take in this regard would be to prohibit the export of coal.

Mr. CHARLTON.—The Government cannot do that.

Mr. HUGHES.—That is true. We cannot do it unless we pass legislation to that effect. The existing law does not, I understand, empower the Minister for Trade and Customs to prohibit the export of coal, and if it be the desire of the House that the Government should be clothed with that power it must express an opinion to that effect, and legislation can be brought forward which honorable members may discuss and adopt or reject as they deem fit. This is a general question that does not affect any party. Coal consumers are not members of political parties. A man does not burn coal because he happens to be a farmer, or a member of the Opposition, or a member sitting on the Government side. He burns it because he wants to do so.

Mr. TUDOR.—The trouble is that one cannot get much coal to burn.

Mr. HUGHES.—Quite so. I accept that correction. But if honorable members express a general desire that the export of coal should be interfered with, the Government will consider whether it is desirable to bring in the necessary legislation, throwing upon the House the responsibility for it. If, on the other hand, we are not to interfere with the export trade—and I certainly do not think we should do so—then I tell honorable members candidly that we cannot expect the coal mine-owners not to sell their coal in the market which pays them best. I think, in the best interests of Australia, it would be a bad step to kill the foreign trade.

Mr. CHARLTON.—Hear, hear! If we did so it would kill the mining.

Mr. HUGHES.—It would be a case of killing the goose that lays the golden egg. We must have an expanding, and not a diminishing, coal trade. I have answered this question at some length,

because it is a matter of importance. I think I have dealt with it fairly. I repeat that if there is a general desire to interfere with the export coal trade, the House must express that desire, and if it does so, the Government will consider the matter of bringing in the necessary legislation. Otherwise it does not propose to interfere with the trade.

Mr. CHARLTON.—Is the Prime Minister aware that at the present time efforts are being made to overtake the demand for coal by the opening up of several collieries that were idle during the war, and that there is now about three quarters of a million tons of coal lying at grass at Newcastle, which can be shipped at any time?

Mr. HUGHES.—I was not aware that collieries are now opening up which were closed, but I am not surprised to hear it. It is a matter for congratulation that we are able, not only to hold our own in the matter of our pre-war coal trade, but also to look forward with some degree of hope to expanding it. I am aware that coal which is the property of this Government is lying at grass. If that is the coal to which the honorable member refers, all I have to say is that it is there for the purpose of enabling this Government to have, if occasion demands, sufficient coal for its ships of war, for its mercantile marine, and for the industries of this country. We must have some reserve to fall back on if the miners carry out their threat to cease producing coal altogether. It would be mere midsummer-night's madness to allow that coal to go, in the face of existing circumstances. We are told in the press this morning that there is a serious probability of trouble. Honorable members know that lately I have been meeting the coal miners and owners very frequently in an endeavour to secure a settlement; but this morning's papers state that there is a probability of the miners ceasing work. I do not propose to allow our reserve of coal to be exported or distributed. It is there as a reserve; and if the miners, throwing aside all counsels of prudence and common sense, elect to resort to the arbitrament of force, we shall have to use that coal.

Mr. FENTON.—Is it not true that the Commonwealth Government have power to prevent the export of wheat on

account of the contemplated shortage of that article in Australia? If so, cannot the same rule be applied to the export of coal until Australian requirements are met?

Mr. HUGHES.—I can only answer the honorable member to the best of my knowledge and belief. The Customs Act does not enable the Government to place such an embargo upon the export of coal as would amount to a prohibition.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF PARLIAMENT.

SALARIES, BONUSES, AND PROMOTIONS.

Dr. MALONEY.—Will the Prime Minister supply the following information to the House?

1. A return showing the salaries and wages drawn by all officers or employees engaged in and about the Federal Parliament for the years 1914 to 1920, inclusive, showing the amounts of money received annually by each person opposite each name.

2. The names of all permanent and temporary officers and employees engaged in and about the Federal Parliament to whom bonuses were promised, and the amount received by each person.

3. Information showing the promotions promised to any officer during the current financial year, showing the names and the amounts of increases to be received.

Mr. HUGHES.—This matter arose in a previous question put to me by an honorable member. I, myself, asked a question of Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as a private member, in regard to the same subject. I am not at all sure as to my authority here. These officers are officers of the Parliament, and it is for Mr. Speaker and the President to supply this information. But, as I said before, when referring to this matter. I think that this House, when it comes to discuss the Estimates, should have all the facts called for by the honorable member before it. I asked for that information. I shall support the honorable member's request for the furnishing of these particulars. Perhaps, Mr. Deputy Speaker will take official notice of the fact that I do support the request, and that I ask for the information to be supplied.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—I may say that the information is available, and can be supplied at once.

POST AND TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT.

COUNTRY MAIL CONTRACTORS.

Mr. NICHOLLS.—Has the Postmaster-General completed his investigations into the position of country mail contractors, and into the matter of increasing their present contract rates, in view of drought and other unforeseen circumstances? If so, will he make an early announcement to the House upon the subject?

Mr. WISE.—I will do so—probably next week.

PASSPORTS.

UNITED STATES AND AUSTRALIA.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Has the attention of the Government been called to a published statement to the effect that a charge of about £3 6s. 8d. has been made by the United States authorities to *visé* the passports of Australian visitors to Honolulu? If that information is correct, will the Government take steps to make a reciprocal charge against Americans visiting Australia?

Mr. POYNTON.—This matter has been brought under my notice. I have had an appeal despatched to the Government of the United States of America in order to see whether something more reasonable cannot be done. The Government is still in communication with the United States authorities. In regard to the latter portion of the honorable member's question, I do not know that two wrongs make a right.

RUSSIAN NATIONALS.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—In reference to the question which I asked on the 8th July, regarding the position of Russians now resident in the Commonwealth who wish to return to their own country, the Prime Minister informed me that he was in communication with the British Government. Has he received any information which he is prepared to furnish to the House?

Mr. HUGHES.—I have not received information from the British Government, but I have noticed in the press the report of a statement made, I understand, by the British Prime Minister. So far as I apprehend the facts, Russians in Great Britain are quite free to

return to their own country. Speaking offhand, and subject, of course, to correction, I know of no reason whatever why Russians who are free in this country should not be allowed to return to Russia.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—In the agreement the British Government undertook to provide transport.

Mr. HUGHES.—The British Government has nothing whatever to do with the position in Australia. Of course, this Government, whenever possible, acts in conformity with the policy of the Imperial Government in regard to such matters. It is most undesirable to have a policy in one portion of the Empire differing from that of other portions of the Empire. Apart from that, we have power to make what laws we please in the matter of permitting the entrance of persons to this country, or of providing for their exclusion, or of allowing them to depart. We can bring in, keep out, bind or let loose whom we will. However, I will look into the law upon this subject and give the honorable member a considered answer by Wednesday next. To repeat my own personal opinion, I know of no reason why Russians resident in Australia should be prevented from departing to their native land.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—I have in my hand a copy of the agreement entered into between the British Government and the Russian Soviet Government, which states that the British Government will repatriate all Russian civilians in the British Empire, or in any territory where the British Government exercises direct authority. There is a further clause to the effect that the British Government will also arrange for transport for those who desire to return home.

Mr. HUGHES.—The agreement referred to by the honorable member was one it was proposed to ratify between the Russian Soviet Government and the British Government. It was not consummated. On the eve of its consummation, there was a disagreement between the parties. The point referred to there differs altogether from that with which I was dealing. The British Government proposed, not that Russians might return to Russia, but that the Imperial authorities would assist them to do so. That is the

point; I had not raised it. I was directing my remarks to the matter of their freedom to go to their own country when and in what manner they pleased. But if the British Government have any agreement with the Soviet Government to repatriate Russians from any part of the British Empire, provided the Soviet Government act reciprocally, the Commonwealth Government, when officially notified to that effect, will do everything that it is called upon to do to assist the British Government in carrying out their policy.

POST-OFFICE DIRECTORIES.

Dr. MALONEY.—Will the Postmaster-General issue instructions that up-to-date directories shall be supplied to suburban post-offices that are at present using out-of-date ones? Will he also consider the advisability of bringing before Cabinet the necessity for issuing a Commonwealth directory based upon the splendid information contained in the Commonwealth electoral rolls?

Mr. WISE.—Yes.

* PAY OF DEFENCE FORCES.

Mr. MARR asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, upon notice—

1. Whether any representations have been made by District Commandants of any Military Districts to the Department of Defence on the subject of the dissatisfaction existing amongst the members of the Permanent Forces concerning the new rates of pay which took effect from 1st April, 1920?

2. If so, will the Minister lay all the papers connected therewith on the table of the House?

3. Is it a fact that a number of officers did not receive any immediate increase under the new rates of pay, and will not receive any benefit under such rates for some years?

4. Is it a fact that the rates of travelling allowance issuable to many officers have recently been reduced, notwithstanding that the cost of travelling has been greatly increased?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE. — The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1 and 2. Reports have been furnished by District Commandants for the information of the Minister, but it is not considered advisable to make such reports public. The honorable member can be assured that all reports and recommendations have been given full consideration in connexion with the preparation of the Estimates.

3. The only officers who will not receive an immediate increase of pay are junior lieutenants with less than five years' service. In these cases it is considered that the existing rates are ample.

4. It has been thought advisable to bring the rates of travelling allowance for members of the Military Forces into conformity with the rates prevailing in the Public Service generally. Under the Public Service rates, some members receive slightly less than was formerly paid, whilst others receive a small increase.

PUBLIC SERVICE.

ADMISSION OF REJECTED VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. BRENNAN asked the Treasurer, *upon notice*—

Having regard to the fact that returned soldiers are allowed to sit for examinations for positions in the Clerical Division of the Public Service, will persons who, in good faith, have presented themselves for military service and have been rejected, and who have been employed temporarily in the Service during war time, be allowed the same privilege?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Persons rejected for service with the Australian Imperial Force have not the same claim for appointment to the Public Service as have those who have served with the Forces, and for whom special provision is made in the Public Service Act in the matter of examinations.

NAVAL RADIO SERVICE.

Mr. MARKS asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

1. Is it the intention of the Government on transferring the naval radio service to the Postmaster-General to retain this service as a separate Department of the Postmaster-General?

2. Is it the intention of the Government that the ranks and ratings of the present naval radio be transferred to this Department irrespective of having been previously employed by the Postmaster-General?

3. If so, what is the proposed intention as to the permanency or temporary employment on transfer?

4. If so, what is the intention as regards officers or men who cannot be absorbed in the transfer?

5. Is any guarantee to be given that on transfer ranks and ratings suffer no disability as to their present pay and status?

6. Who is to be the arbitrator as to the grading of these ranks and ratings on transfer?

7. What compensation is to be given to ranks and ratings for the loss of uniform, which is no longer of any service?

Mr. WISE.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. No.

2. It is proposed to take over the present staff at the existing stations and such officers of the central staff as will be required.

3. This is a matter within the province of the Public Service Commissioner, and action will be governed by the provisions of the Public Service Act.

4. These are officers of the Navy, whom it is not necessary to transfer.

5. No guarantee can be given, but see answer to question number 6. The Public Service Commissioner will give full consideration to the claims of each officer.

6. The classification of the radio staff will be determined by the Governor-General on the recommendation of the Public Service Commissioner.

7. This matter has not yet come before me for consideration, and I am not, therefore, in a position to answer the question at present.

SALE OF KHAKI CLOTH.

Dr. MALONEY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, *upon notice*—

With reference to the advertised sale of khaki cloth by the Department of Defence, will the Minister inform the House—

1. What did the cloth cost the Department per yard?

2. What do, or did, the officers and permanent staff pay for this or similar cloth per yard?

3. If any offer has been made by Flinders-lane houses or woollen merchants, what was the price per yard offered?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. The cloth cost the Department for manufacture, from 6s. 2d. to 7s. 2½d. per yard, exclusive of examination, handling, and storage charges, interest on outlay, and selling expenses.

2. The cloth has been sold to permanent military officers at a reduced rate, for uniforms only, at 7s. 7d. per yard.

3. A large parcel of the cloth was sold by public tender some months ago at 17s. per yard, and when public tenders were invited a short time ago for the purchase of 20,000 yards of the cloth, the tenders received disclosed that the whole of this quantity could have been sold to wholesale houses at from 15s. to 20s. per yard.

RATINGS FROM ROYAL NAVY.

Mr. MARKS asked the Minister for the Navy, *upon notice*—

1. Is it a fact that nearly 368 ratings ex-Royal Navy whose time has expired in the Royal Australian Navy are awaiting passage back to England?

2. If so, and apart from those over age, what is the reason why the rest are not effecting re-engagement in the Royal Australian Navy?

3. Should their services not be required, why is it that a draft of men numbering about 120 have recently arrived from the Royal Navy for service with the Royal Australian Navy, holding ratings similar to those awaiting their return to England?

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. No.

2. See answer to No. 1.

3. The draft recently arrived from England includes ratings required to fill vacancies existing in the complements of H.M.A. ships, and also reliefs for ratings on loan from the Royal Navy whose period of agreement to serve in the Royal Australian Navy has expired or will shortly expire.

RETURNED SOLDIERS.

STATE ASSISTANCE.

Dr. MALONEY asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Will he have a statement made showing what assistance is given by the various States to returned soldiers and sailors in addition to the assistance provided by the Commonwealth Government so that a comparison can be readily made between the States?

2. Will all the States give equal opportunities to all Australian soldiers?

3. If not, which State will and which State will not?

Mr. HUGHES.—It is considered that no good purpose would be served by making comparisons in the direction indicated by the honorable member.

REMITTANCES TO GERMANY.

Mr. GABB asked the Postmaster-General, *upon notice*—

1. Whether it is now possible to remit money to Germany through the Post Office, provided the permission of the Public Trustee has been obtained?

2. If not, is the Postal Department not losing revenue thereby, as remittances may be made per bank draft, with permission?

3. If so, will the Minister take steps to remedy this?

Mr. WISE.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follow:—

1. Yes.

2 and 3. See answer to No. 1.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING.

ASSAULT AT BROKEN HILL.

Mr. CONSIDINE asked the Minister representing the Minister for Defence, *upon notice*—

1. Whether his attention has been drawn to the recent prosecution and conviction of Lieutenant Jacobs for assaulting a lad under the age of 16 years during the course of a compulsory military parade at Broken Hill?

2. If so, what action, if any, does the Minister intend taking to protect trainees from official brutality of this description?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—No. Inquiries will, however, be made, and whatever action is considered necessary will be taken.

INSULATED SPACE ON STEAMERS.

Mr. JOWETT (for Mr. McWILLIAMS) asked the Minister controlling shipping, *upon notice*—

Whether, in view of the announcement that the Imperial Government finds it necessary to retain the requisition of the insulated space on all steamers trading with Australia till April, 1921, he will endeavour to obtain control of the said space, in order to secure a fair distribution of shipping to producers of Australia?

Mr. POYNTON.—The allocation of space on vessels for overseas is carried out by the Overseas Central Committee, but inquiry will be made in regard to the question raised by the honorable member.

INCIDENCE OF TAXATION.

GENERAL EXEMPTION — TAXATION COMMISSION—STARR-BOWKETT SOCIETIES.

Mr. NICHOLLS asked the Treasurer, *upon notice*—

Whether it is the intention of the Government, in view of the high cost of living, to amend the Income Tax Act, with a view to increasing the present exemptions to an amount of not less than £250?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—This question will be inquired into by the Royal Commission on Taxation.

Mr. GABB asked the Treasurer, *upon notice*—

1. Whether it was stated in the invitation to the Trades Hall to select a representative to the proposed Taxation Commission, that the question of unfair incidence of income tax upon the lowest-paid daily workers would be considered?

2. Does the Government refuse to refer to the proposed Taxation Commission the question of the unfair position in which the 12s. 6d. per day man of 1920 is placed as compared with the 7s. and 8s. per day man of, say, 1913, in regard to paying income tax?

3. If the Government does so refuse, is it doing so because the Trades Hall refused to select a representative on the proposed Taxation Commission?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—It is the intention of the Government that all matters affecting the incidence of taxation shall be inquired into by the Royal Commission on Taxation.

Mr. NICHOLLS asked the Treasurer, *upon notice*—

Whether he will exempt Starr-Bowkett societies from Federal taxation, as is done in the State of New South Wales, for the following reasons:—(a) That Starr-Bowkett societies are maintained by persons whose salary is below £200 per annum; (b) that each member has to pay an individual tax; (c) that the taxation of Starr-Bowkett societies imposes additional financial burdens upon those who have already paid their share of taxation?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I can only repeat that the Royal Commission on Taxation will inquire into all questions covered by the incidence of Commonwealth taxation.

HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Mr. MAKIN asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Whether the Government intends appointing a High Commissioner to represent Australia in the United States of America?

2. If so, will this necessitate establishing an Australia House at Washington?

3. If so, what amount of expense is it anticipated that this proposed representation in America will involve Australia in annually?

Mr. HUGHES.—An announcement regarding this matter will be made at an early date.

OLD-AGE AND INVALID PENSIONS.

Mr. FENTON (for Mr. MAKIN) asked the Treasurer, *upon notice*—

1. Whether the Government has definitely decided to give a further increase in the amount of the old-age and invalid pension to meet the increased cost of living?

2. If so, what is the nature of such decision?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Consideration has already been given to the matter, but it is regretted that the financial position of the Commonwealth will not permit of

a further increase at this juncture. The question of increasing the amount permitted to be earned by pensioners is receiving consideration.

PENSION FOR TEMPORARY INCAPACITY.

Mr. NICHOLLS asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Whether it is the intention of the Government to make provision for the payment of a temporary pension to persons who are temporarily incapacitated?

2. Is it a fact that many persons have been refused the invalid pension on the grounds that they were not totally incapacitated, such persons having lost one leg and one eye?

Mr. HUGHES.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows:—

1. It is regretted that the financial position will not permit the Government to pay the pensions suggested.

2. Pensions have been refused to persons who were not totally incapacitated, but it is not possible to say what claims, if any, have been rejected under the circumstances mentioned. If, however, the Department is furnished with particulars of any such case, the matter will be fully investigated.

NAURU ISLAND AGREEMENT.

Mr. FENTON (for Mr. MAKIN) asked the Treasurer, *upon notice*—

1. What is the amount already paid by the Commonwealth Government in respect to the Nauru Island agreement?

2. What is the annual financial commitment of the Commonwealth in respect to the Nauru Island agreement?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows:—

1. £1,470,000.

2. Article 2 of the Nauru Island agreement reads—

“All the expenses of the Administration (including the remuneration of the Administrator and of the Commissioners), so far as they are not met by other revenue, shall be defrayed out of the proceeds of the sales of the phosphates.”

MATERNITY ALLOWANCE.

Mr. FOWLER asked the Prime Minister, *upon notice*—

1. Whether it is a fact that certain Jewish mothers in Australia have been refused the maternity bonus because they are natives of Palestine?

2. If so, will steps be taken to enable such women to obtain the bonus?

Mr. HUGHES.—The answers to the honorable member's questions are as follows:—

1. The maternity allowance claims of Jewish mothers born in Asia have been rejected in view of the statutory provision that maternity allowances shall not be paid to women who are Asiatics.

2. An opinion is now being sought from the Law Officers of the Crown as to whether Jewish mothers born in Asia may be regarded as other than Asiatics within the meaning of the Maternity Allowance Act.

ELECTIONS AND REFERENDUMS.

ELECTORS IN COUNTRY DISTRICTS:

Mr. JOWETT (Grampians) [3.24].—I move—

That, in the opinion of this House, the Commonwealth Constitution should be amended, to meet the convenience and necessities of electors in the country districts, by insuring that no Commonwealth general election nor any Commonwealth referendum shall take place between the middle of any November and the middle of the following March.

The intention of the motion is to insure that the people of Australia living outside the great cities shall not in future be put to inconvenience by having general elections and referendums to attend to during those months which cover the harvesting period. The last Commonwealth general election was held on 13th December, and country electors were in consequence put to enormous inconvenience, not only on that day, but on many preceding days and nights. To those who live in the cities and towns, and visit the country only for holidays or pleasure, it is immaterial when elections are held. They have good roads, with asphalt footpaths, trams, and other means of conveyance, and polling booths almost at their doors. But nearly half of the population still lives in the country, although the position is becoming worse daily through the continual growth of the great cities.

Mr. FENTON.—Has the honorable member compared the percentage of votes cast last December with the voting at earlier elections held in other parts of the year?

Mr. JOWETT.—No, but I shall be glad if the honorable member will give us the benefit of what he knows on that subject, though, of course, it has nothing to do with the matter before the House. Let me mention one or two instances of extreme inconvenience to country people during the last electoral campaign which came under my notice. In

one district I had arranged to speak at a hall, and in my innocence thought that I would be expected to commence the meeting at 8 o'clock; but I found from my farming friends with whom I was supping that they could not leave the fields until after 7 p.m., and could not take their evening meal until about 8 o'clock. After that we had to travel to get to the hall. Anyhow, it was 10 o'clock before the meeting commenced.

Mr. BELL.—Had it been advertised to commence at 8 o'clock?

Mr. JOWETT.—The fact that I was going to speak had been advertised, though the lack of adequate postal facilities is such that I do not know whether every elector was able to read the advertisement in time.

Mr. LISTER.—But still they were quite satisfied with you.

Mr. JOWETT.—Yes, and in the district of which I am now speaking gave me a majority of about five to one. In another farming district, either because they were certain that I would be elected in any event, or because it was too inconvenient to go to the poll, I was told that only 52 per cent. of those on the roll voted. Of course, harvesting operations do not in any one part of the Commonwealth extend over a period of four months, but in Queensland and in parts of Western Australia it is extremely inconvenient to travel during what is known as the wet season, which, in the northern part of Australia, is usually in December and in the early months of the year. There is no reason why elections and referendums should take place between the middle of November and the middle of March.

Mr. ROBERT COOK.—Would the honorable member make an exception of elections following a double dissolution?

Mr. JOWETT.—I do not propose to make any exception. Those responsible for the government of the Commonwealth know a long time beforehand when elections and referendums are likely to take place, and it would be easy for them to arrange to hold them on dates between the middle of March and the middle of November.

Mr. POYNTON.—The date of holding a general election is determined largely by the date of the termination of the office of honorable senators.

Mr. JOWETT.—Surely we could provide for an amendment of the Constitution which would get over that difficulty.

Mr. LISTER.—Does the honorable member propose to lengthen the life of this Parliament by six months?

Mr. JOWETT.—No doubt many honorable members would be glad to have the life of this Parliament lengthened.

Dr. MALONEY.—I am for annual Parliaments.

Mr. JOWETT.—Well, all I am concerned with now is the prevention of inconvenience to country electors by the holding of elections and referendums in midsummer, when in many parts of Australia harvesting operations are taking place, and in Queensland and Western Australia it is the wet season. An amendment of the Constitution is needed to do what I suggest, because otherwise a Government that thought that it would improve its position by fixing an election for the summer season would do so, and I wish to make that impossible. I shall not labour the question, because the motion is one which I think the House will support, and, after full discussion, carry without a dissident.

Mr. STEWART (Wimmera) [3.35].—The question involved in this motion is a very serious one to farmers. The holding of the last general election in the middle of the harvest was a great inconvenience; and there was a deep-rooted feeling that the Government had fixed the time to suit themselves, and were not very particular whether it suited the farmers. Any Government claiming to be democratic should do all in its power to hold elections at a time most suitable to the general community, and the farmers are surely entitled to a little consideration. For these and other quite obvious reasons I second the motion.

Mr. FENTON (Maribyrnong) [3.37].—I had some experience of election campaigning in the country during the month of December last, including the Grampians and a considerable portion of the Mallee; and I am quite in sympathy with the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) when he speaks of being quite unable to get his meetings together before 10 o'clock at night. Harvesting operations are in full swing in the month of December, and I know that most of the meetings I had the pleasure of addressing did not, as a rule, commence until between 9 and 10 o'clock.

However punctual one might be in arriving at the meeting place at 8 o'clock, with a view to leaving plenty of time for questions and so forth, I found that owing to the conditions it was very often after midnight before I could get to bed. In the city electorates, on the other hand, the months of November, December, and January are very much appreciated as a time for elections, for the simple reason that most of the speaking has to be done in the open air in the evenings, and for this purpose the summer is much pleasanter than the winter. The Queensland electors have often very strongly pleaded that elections should not be held in that State when it is subject to the monsoonal rains.

Mr. HIGGS.—We have heavy rains in February and March, and sometimes in April.

Mr. FENTON.—I know that a very strong point has been made of this fact in Queensland. However, I do not see that we should take such a drastic step as to bring about an amendment in the Constitution; in my opinion, an amendment of the Electoral Act would prove sufficiently binding on any Ministry of the day. We might amend that Act so as to provide that as far as practicable elections should be held at a time of year most suitable to the great bulk of the electors. It would be impossible to have a cast-iron rule as to the time of year. Sometimes the temper of Parliament is such that a crisis occurs, as has happened in the past, particularly on that occasion when the Prime Minister of the day announced to a startled House that he had recommended, and had been granted, a double dissolution. Under such circumstances as that it would not do to have a section of the Constitution that would prevent the people giving an early expression to their opinions.

Mr. NICHOLLS.—You do not anticipate anything of the kind now?

Mr. FENTON.—We live in times when we may anticipate anything, whether in the electoral, the parliamentary, the social, the industrial, or the financial sphere. I do not feel inclined to vote for the motion in its present form, because I do not think it is fair to the Parliament to go so far.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—What would be the value of the motion if carried?

Mr. FENTON.—Of course, the Government could ignore it; and I think

that our Constitution and the Electoral Act should be equal to all occasions. What could be done to carry out a proposal of this kind if a political crisis occurred between the middle of November and the middle of March?

Mr. JOWETT.—What do we do now? We cannot have an election under a month, and at the worst the period in the motion is only four months.

Mr. FENTON.—The electors could not wait that long; and this presents one of the difficulties of the motion. We could amend the Electoral Act now, but to amend the Constitution we must wait until there is another general election. I recommend the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) to consult with his friends with a view to drafting a motion that will meet with the unanimous approval of the House. This is a motion I should vote against with reluctance, because I desire the electors to have every opportunity to express their opinion; but in its present form I cannot support it.

Mr. PROWSE (Swan) [3.45].—I support the motion for the reasons that the mover has advanced. It certainly is difficult for farming people to find time for political affairs in their busiest time of the year. To do this they must cease work; and in a producing community like that of Australia, that is a very serious consideration, not only for the farmer, but for all. If no general election were held between the two dates suggested, much of the present difficulty would be got over. At other times of the year the farming community are not at their busiest, nor is the work so important as it was, for instance, when the general elections were held last year. December proved a most inopportune time, and, therefore, I hope the House will support the motion with a view to the Government finding some means to give it legislative sanction.

Mr. BELL (Darwin) [3.47].—I am sure the motion is submitted with the best intentions, and I have every sympathy with its object; but it must be remembered that there are parts of the Commonwealth in which other periods of the year would prove most unsuitable for elections.

Mr. PROWSE.—Name them.

Mr. BELL.—There is my own electorate. I am afraid the proposed close

season for elections is a little too long. If the period proposed had been from the 1st December to the end of February I might have been able to accord it my support; but, in my electorate, which it must be admitted is a country one, we have a long and heavy wet season. Some of the electors there have to travel fully twenty miles to record their votes, and I do not desire any proposal that would result in further restricting their opportunities of getting to the poll. As a matter of fact, in the winter season in Tasmania it is almost impossible to travel for voting purposes. It would certainly be unreasonable to ask the women electors to travel at such a time, and we wish to see the women at the poll, because their votes are usually on the right side. It must be admitted that the climatic conditions vary very greatly from north to south in Australia. In my own electorate March is about the best possible month for an election, and I should not like any part of that month excluded.

Mr. JOWETT.—Is the honorable member aware that a large number of people on the mainland take a delight in visiting Tasmania during the months mentioned in the motion?

Mr. BELL.—I am not saying that the months mentioned in the motion are not suitable, but if the House decides that they are unsuitable the tendency will be in fixing polling day to get as far away from those months as possible. The months of May, June, July, August, and September may cover the period when the people in some parts are the least busy, and when the climatic conditions are the best, but they would be the worst possible months for the holding of an election in Tasmania. The honorable member proposes to amend the Constitution, but I do not think it is necessary to go to that extent. His purpose could well be served by a simple amendment to the Electoral Act. I do not think the honorable member need fear that any Government would choose a month for an election when people are not likely to go to the polling booths. He may be quite right in claiming that the months of December, January, and February are unsuitable for the holding of an election in many parts of Australia, because the harvest operations are in full swing; but I represent the interests of people who live in a very wet climate and who could

not get to the poll if the close season which the honorable member seeks to fix were extended to the month of March.

Mr. CONSIDINE (Barrier) [3.53].—I shall vote against the motion, because it is quite futile even if carried. If the House agrees to it no attention will be paid to it by the present Government. They will simply regard it as a pious expression of opinion. According to the honorable member for Darwin (Mr. Bell) a simple alteration of the Electoral Act would meet the position far better than would the more difficult process of amending the Constitution, but the fact remains that those who support a certain Government can amend the Electoral law as it suits them, just as was done with a view to influencing a by-election in the Corangamite division, a matter which was brought under our notice very forcibly during the last Parliament. It is all very well to talk about consulting the wishes of the public.

Mr. HILL.—I suppose they are the last that should be considered.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—They are the last that are considered by the various political parties who occupy the Treasury bench. No honorable member is so unsophisticated as not to know that the majority in possession of the Treasury bench will fix the election time to suit their own political purposes. They will choose the time which they deem to be most favorable for securing their return with a majority.

Sir. JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member does not suggest that his party would do such a thing?

Mr. CONSIDINE.—In this regard I do not discriminate between political parties who may happen to occupy the Treasury bench. Possibly the Treasurer (Sir Joseph Cook), as an old hand at the political game, may believe that every honorable member who rises to speak says only what he deems to be in the interests of his political party, but I am dealing with this motion on its merits, and I say that it will have no effect on the present Administration, or on any Administration. The majority will naturally choose the most opportune time for consulting the electors.

Mr. JOWETT.—That is what I wish to prevent.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Then the honorable member might as well get out with

a broom and attempt to sweep back the sea.

Mr. STEWART.—Are not Governments apt to make blunders occasionally?

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Certainly; and I hope that when they meet the electors on the next occasion the present Government will make the biggest blunder of their lives. But the fact that Administrations make blunders does not do away with the futility of the motion which the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) has already admitted is of no practical use. As it would involve an amendment of the Constitution, it will be necessary to submit it to a referendum, and secure a majority of the voters of the Commonwealth, and a majority of the various States. Here again the opportune time for submitting the question to the people will be decided by the Administration, who, if they are opposed to it, will choose the most inopportune time for securing a vote on the question.

Mr. JOWETT.—It is my desire to take the responsibility out of the hands of any unscrupulous Government.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—The honorable member cannot achieve that object unless he puts out the present Government and takes their place, which he has not the slightest intention of doing. The motion is simply a piece of window dressing. The mover, knowing that nothing can be done, and that the carrying of the motion will lead us nowhere, is simply helping the Government to monopolize the time of the House. He brings forward a complaint about the farmers—a very necessary portion of the community, but, nevertheless, not the only portion. The shearers, and others who follow a migratory calling, are also a very necessary portion of the community.

Mr. JOWETT.—Would they be placed at any disadvantage by the adoption of the motion?

Mr. CONSIDINE.—The men who leave the cities to go shearing in the country areas would be enrolled in city electorates, and they would certainly be inconvenienced by having to work in the shearing sheds during the period in which the honorable member wishes elections to be held.

Mr. JOWETT.—They could vote by post or as absentees.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—The postal vote does not appeal to me. It is capable of manipulation by the party which happens to be in control of the election.

Mr. JOWETT.—Then let the honorable member bring forward a motion to abolish it.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—The honorable member knows very well that when it had the opportunity to do so, the Labour party voted solidly against the inclusion of the postal vote provisions in the Electoral Bill. I do not think that the honorable member, by comparing the votes polled in May, 1917, with those polled in December, 1920, can show that any great inconvenience was occasioned to the particular section of the community whose opinions he claims to be voicing by the holding of the election in December. I do not think that statistics of the voting would prove the honorable member's case. There is a considerable apathy among the electors of Australia, but that is not due to the fact that people are engaged in farming or other occupations at election time.

Mr. JOWETT.—Does the honorable member deny that there is any inconvenience to the farmers by having to vote in the middle of a harvest?

Mr. CONSIDINE.—There would be no more inconvenience to a particular section of the community, such as the farmers, by holding an election in December, than there would be to other sections if the date of the election was at any fixed period of the year. With a fixed date, there would always be inconvenience to one section or another, but my opinion is that the people who want to vote will go to the polls at whatever inconvenience to themselves. The fixing of the date would not make the citizens of Australia vote who have not hitherto voted.

Mr. JOWETT.—It would help them to do so.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—I do not think we have ever had a 70 per cent. vote of the people of Australia.

Mr. TUDOR.—In Queensland, at the 1910 election, there was a poll of over 80 per cent.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—I am speaking from memory, and I do not think we have ever had such a poll for the whole of Australia. We certainly have not had it at recent elections.

Mr. STEWART.—The main contention of the honorable member for Grampians

is not that farmers do not record their votes, but that great inconvenience is caused to them through having to do so when they have ripe crops to be harvested.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—There is a considerable number of farmers in the Riverina portion of the Barrier electorate, and I have not heard any complaints from them about the inconvenience of polling day.

Mr. JOWETT.—Perhaps they do not give their votes to the honorable member.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—I think I can say that the farmers in the Riverina district have supplied me with my majority.

Mr. PROWSE.—Then the honorable member should be careful how he votes on this motion.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—I am not susceptible to intimidation. During the period in which I have represented the Barrier I have not received any complaints either from my working farmer constituents or from any other section in the matter of the dates on which elections have been held. Honorable members will note that I refer to working farmers.

Mr. PROWSE.—Are you speaking as a practical farmer?

Mr. GIBSON.—The honorable member had too much sense to remain on the land.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—The possession of a certain area of land is no proof that the honorable member possesses common sense. I have never held land to work it myself. I have worked it for the other fellow as a farm labourer. I have no quarrel with the man who takes up land and works it. I agree with the honorable member for Wimmera (Mr. Stewart) when he remarked recently that the interests of the men who work in the workshop and the factory are identical with those of the men who work on the land. I look forward to the day when the working farmer and the man in the workshop, in the mine, and in the factory will join hands and rule this country as it should be ruled. But motions such as that at present under discussion will neither facilitate that end nor achieve any useful result. Therefore, I regard this as a pure waste of time.

Mr. BURCHELL (Fremantle) [4.8].—If this motion were agreed to, and its terms were eventually embraced in the Constitution, it would prove altogether

too binding. In the future there may arise such a set of circumstances as would enforce an election, quite irrespective of the desire of the Government of the day, or of the Opposition, or of any other party in this Chamber. If the Constitution were to be amended to provide for the holding of elections between the middle of November and the middle of the following March, it would prove too cramping upon the community and this Parliament. I draw the attention of the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) to the existing situation. Some years ago the Constitution was amended, following upon a referendum, with respect to the election of senators. The alteration was made specifically to meet the convenience of country electors.

Mr. TUDOR.—And the then sitting senators were deliberately given six months' additional tenure in order to achieve that object.

Mr. BURCHELL.—That is so. The Constitution was altered, following upon a referendum in which the people approved of the question as placed before them. This House is practically controlled, in the matter of the periods of its election, by the life of the Senate. Within the past few months we have witnessed the election of a number of senators, who, however, were not able to occupy their seats in the Senate for quite a long period after the day of their election. I agree with the honorable member for Maribyrnong (Mr. Fenton), who expressed the view that an amendment of the Electoral Act governing this matter should be sufficient. I do not oppose the desire that this House shall keep in step, generally, with the Senate in the matter of election dates. In fact, that would be the proper course to follow.

Mr. JOWETT.—It was necessary to alter the Constitution to meet the convenience of the public in relation to Senate elections. Why can not a similar procedure be followed in respect to the election of members of this House?

Mr. BURCHELL.—To make the matter effective it would be necessary to seek to amend the Constitution between the present moment and the next ordinary general election; and that would involve the taking of a special referendum, which costs between £80,000 and £100,000.

Mr. JOWETT.—That would not be necessary. This Parliament can continue

until February, 1923, and, thus, there would be no necessity for the next general election to be held before March in that year.

Mr. BURCHELL.—The three-year period for which honorable members are elected operates from the day on which Parliament is first called together. This Parliament was called together on 26th February last, and, in the course of ordinary events, it will not expire until the end of February, 1923. The next ordinary general election cannot possibly be held before the middle of April, 1923; so the honorable member's objective will have been obtained.

Mr. JOWETT.—But I desire this reform to be permanent, and not to fit in merely with the next general election.

Mr. BURCHELL.—I call the attention of the honorable member to section 13 of the Constitution Act—

As soon as may be after the Senate first meets, and after each first meeting of the Senate following a dissolution thereof, the Senate shall divide the senators chosen for each State into two classes, as nearly equal in number as practicable; and the places of the senators of the first class shall become vacant at the expiration of three years, and the places of those of the second class at the expiration of six years, from the beginning of their term of service; and afterwards the places of senators shall become vacant at the expiration of six years from the beginning of their term of service.

The election to fill vacant places shall be made within one year before the places are to become vacant.

For the purposes of this section, the term of service of a senator shall be taken to begin on the first day of July following the day of his election.

The Constitution originally read that the term should begin on the 1st day of January following the date of a senator's election. Naturally, it is desirable that the elections for the House of Representatives should coincide with those in connexion with the Senate. I invite honorable members to assume that, from 1923 onwards, each ordinary general election for both Houses of the Federal Legislature will be conducted on the same day. The Constitution now provides for that, so that there is no need to further amend it.

Mr. JOWETT.—There was an election in the middle of last harvest. I want to make that impossible for the future.

Mr. BURCHELL.—It is a laudable desire, but there may be dissolutions at any time.

Mr. FENTON.—Does the honorable member for Grampians wish to spend £100,000 in forcing this question?

Mr. JOWETT.—No; but to have it put before the people at the next ordinary election.

Mr. BURCHELL.—I have pointed out that the expenditure involved in a referendum amounts to between £80,000 and £100,000.

Mr. JOWETT.—I do not suggest the taking of a special referendum, but that it should coincide with the next general election.

Mr. BURCHELL.—Honorable members who have studied the Constitution, particularly in its references to the election of members of this Parliament, must be satisfied that the Constitution, as it stands, is sufficiently clear and broad. Political exigencies should be taken into account. An extraordinary difficulty might arise if the Constitution were amended as the honorable member desires. It is quite conceivable that a crisis might arise at the end of November; but, if this proposal were agreed to, it would not be lawful to appeal to the people until the middle of the following March. In those circumstances it would be most unwise for the House to agree to the motion. Although I am in sympathy with the desire of the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) that election days shall be outside the period mentioned in his motion, I think it would be futile to specify election dates in such a cast-iron document as the Constitution.

Mr. NICHOLLS (Macquarie) [4.22].—I regret to feel compelled to oppose the motion. While the honorable member for Grampians (Mr. Jowett) is quite within his rights in conserving the interests of the particular section of the community he represents, we on this side of the House must safeguard the interests of the workers, who are the largest section of the community.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Are not the farmers workers?

Mr. NICHOLLS.—Indirectly, the honorable member for Grampians inferred that they are not, but other sections of the community are entitled to

as much consideration as are the people upon the land. The honorable member proposes that elections shall take place between the months of November and March. He stated that during that period the farmers worked strenuously, and the inference is that for the other seven months they do no work at all.

Mr. JOWETT.—That is a scandalous imputation; they are always working.

Mr. NICHOLLS.—The honorable member has proposed that elections shall not be held during four months of spring and summer. That means that they must be held at the most inopportune time of the year for such a purpose. In winter, people cannot get about the country conveniently on account of the wet and cold weather. We must have regard to the interests of the majority of the people, and there are poor labourers who, if this proposal were agreed to, would be compelled to walk, perhaps, 5 miles to the poll in midwinter, or drive 15 or 20 miles in wet and cold. They are not in the same fortunate position as are the electors whom the honorable member for Grampians represents. Consequently, this proposal would act to the detriment of the labouring classes. In any case, this motion, if adopted, could have no effect, because unforeseen circumstances might arise at any time which would compel the Government to go to the country at once. For instance, there is no guarantee that the present Government will be able to continue in office for another three months, and a cast-iron rule as to when the Government should appeal to the country would not be in the best interests of the people. This scheme would place an obstacle in the way of any immediate and urgent referendum or election. I represent a farming constituency just as important and rich as is the Grampians electorate, and I have heard no complaints from my electors in regard to the dates on which elections are held. The farmers in my electorate are very busy and energetic, but they can always find sufficient time to go to the poll and record their votes in the right direction. I can see no need for haste in making the alteration that is suggested.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [4.28].—I have taken the trouble to look up the statistics for the last general election in order to

ascertain if the holding of an election in December was an actual hardship to country electors. I find that, in Corangamite, 80.27 per cent. of the electors on the roll recorded their votes.

Mr. POYNTON.—That is no proof that the farmers voted.

Mr. TUDOR.—Farmers are more numerous in the electorate of Corangamite than in any other constituency with which I am familiar.

Mr. McGRATH.—A few weeks ago all the farmers in my electorate voted.

Mr. TUDOR.—Yes; and the Country party candidate lost his deposit, and polled worst in the farming districts. The election for the second Federal Parliament was held in the month of December, and so was the 1906 election. Parliament then saw the necessity for altering the Constitution, and the Constitution was amended deliberately to provide that half the Senate should retire at the end of June. The result I have quoted in the Corangamite electorate was repeated in other country constituencies. In the Grampians electorate, 78.20 per cent., and in Indi, 78 per cent. of the electors on the roll recorded their votes. Compare those figures with the percentages in metropolitan electorates. In Henty the percentage was 74, and in Melbourne, 71. I ask leave to continue my remarks on a future occasion.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

RELIEF FOR MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Sir JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta—Treasurer) [4.31]. (*By leave*).—A difficulty has arisen in the House in consequence of the much-to-be-regretted absence of Mr. Speaker. Usually in the temporary absence of Mr. Speaker the Chairman of Committees takes the chair; but no provision is made for any relief to Mr. Deputy Speaker when he is required to occupy the chair for a long period, as at present. I therefore ask the House to agree to this motion, which I hope will be accepted as formal—

That during the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker be authorized to call upon any of the Temporary Chairmen of Committees to temporarily relieve him in the chair.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

DESTITUTE ALLOWANCE.

Debate resumed from 8th July (*vide* page 2621), on motion by Dr. MALONEY—

1. That this House is of opinion that the Invalid and Old-age Pensions Act should be amended, in order to provide for a destitute allowance to be made to all inhabitants who are destitute, so that any person making a statutory declaration (to a postmaster, Customs officer, or other appointed Commonwealth official, a schoolmaster, a union secretary, a magistrate, or other appointed individual) that he or she is insufficiently fed, clothed, or sheltered, shall be paid as soon as possible the sum of 15s. per week, and for each child 7s. 6d. per week, until relieved.

2. That the passing of the foregoing resolution be an instruction to the Government of the Commonwealth to bring in the necessary amending Act.

Mr. LAZZARINI (Werriwa) [4.33].—I have little to add to my previous remarks on this subject. When speaking on the 8th July I was referring to the fact that although the cost of living had increased to an extent that was very hard to estimate, the increase in the old-age pensions had been very small, whilst the invalid pensions had not been advanced at all. I argued that the old-age pension, to comply with what was in the mind of the Parliament which passed the original scheme, should be increased to-day to almost 30s. The Invalid Pensions Act provides that before a member of a family can claim benefits under the Act, he must have a weekly income of less than £1 for each adult, and 10s. for each child. I advocated that those amounts should be increased by at least 50 per cent. The honorable member for Swan (Mr. Prowse), in the course of his argument, referred to a drunkard whom he had warned that he would be left without any provision for his old age. To that the man had replied, "There is the old-age pension." The impression that was left by the honorable member's remarks was that, in his opinion, most of the indigent poor were brought to straitened circumstances by drink.

Mr. PROWSE.—Not at all.

Mr. LAZZARINI.—The impression conveyed to my mind, at all events, was that the honorable member thinks that all those who receive old-age pensions have been drunkards, or at least, improvident, in their earlier life.

Mr. PROWSE.—That impression is quite wrong.

Mr. LAZZARINI.—The honorable member's words convey, at least, the suggestion that the old-age pension system prompts persons to live in a haphazard fashion, secure in the knowledge that towards the end of their days they will be able to obtain pensions.

Mr. PROWSE.—The proposal of the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) would allow able-bodied men of twenty to thirty years of age to sponge on the public.

Mr. LAZZARINI.—As I understand it, it would not do so. I do not wish to repeat arguments that have been used in the debate, but it surprises me that any one should hold the view that it is drunkenness and improvidence that compel people to accept old-age pensions. It is the social system under which we live that forces old people to take pensions to keep body and soul together. Those who are giving their best in the various industries and employments of the country are not receiving sufficient remuneration to enable them to lay by for their old age, and the Legislature, realizing this, provided old-age pensions. We should now go further, and see that the pensions are at least made adequate. I would supplement the old-age and invalid pensions system with the pensions system proposed by this motion. I should be sorry if it were thought that I like to see those who are earning money careless in the spending of it, and living in such a way that they are bound to require support in their old age. It is, however, an undoubted fact that persons who squander their money contribute more to the revenue than those who save it, because of the heavy duties on the commodities which they consume so largely; and thus the old-age pension gives back to them only some part of what they have contributed to the revenue in Customs taxation. The Treasurer has told us that the applications for pensions increase whenever the rates of pensions increase. But it should be patent to a schoolboy that it is the ever-increasing cost of living that makes it more and more difficult for sons and daughters to maintain their parents, and thus causes an increasing number of old persons to apply for pensions. Many people do not like their parents to accept the old-age pension, regarding this as pauperization. That is not my view of it. Nowadays, however, the cost of

living is so high, and is mounting so much higher almost every week, that they find it impossible to rear their families, and also to maintain their parents, and consequently the latter are compelled to apply for old-age pensions.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The cost of living is constantly increasing, but there is not a similar constant increase in the number of old-age pensioners; it is only when the rates of pensions are increased that there is a jump in the applications for pensions.

Mr. LAZZARINI.—I contend that it is economic pressure that is increasing the pension applications. How does the Treasurer know that the applications for pensions are not increasing in a manner corresponding with the increase in the cost of living? He has no statistics showing the weekly applications for pensions. The miserable rate of the allowance that was originally provided for possibly deterred many persons from applying for pensions, because they looked on these as hardly worth applying for. But as the rate has increased, the applications have increased. I do not think that any member of the House would declare himself opposed to the old-age pension system, and, that being so, we should see that the rate of pensions is sufficient for the keeping together of body and soul.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—But what the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) proposes is the setting up of a huge benefit society under the aegis of the Federal Government.

Mr. LAZZARINI.—My view is that, while the old-age and invalid pensions remain so small and so inadequate, some such system as this proposed is needed to supplement them. Therefore, I support the motion, and trust that it may be carried.

Mr. MAKIN (Hindmarsh) [4.47].—I owe it to my constituents to voice my opinions concerning this motion, so that they may know that their representative is alive to their interests, and that in the hearts and minds of members of the National Parliament there is compassion for those who suffer the misfortunes of life, and the desire to help them in difficult times. I certainly hold no brief for those who by misconduct put themselves in unhappy circumstances.

Mr. HILL.—How would the honorable member discriminate between a deserving

and an undeserving applicant for this pension?

Mr. MAKIN.—How is discrimination exercised in the granting of old-age and invalid pensions?

Mr. HILL.—By the verification of the facts alleged by the applicants.

Mr. MAKIN.—There would be similar verification in this case.

Mr. PROWSE.—No; the certificate of a union secretary is to be sufficient.

Mr. MAKIN.—I have as much confidence in union secretaries as in any other men. The positions they hold show them to be men of character and trust.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Not only is the certificate of a union secretary to be sufficient, but such a certificate from a postmaster, schoolmaster, a Customs officer, and the like is to be accepted.

Mr. MAKIN.—Matters of detail can be dealt with when a measure to give effect to the proposal of the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) is under consideration. We can then fully safeguard the interests of the people, and protect the public funds. My concern now is to support the claims of those who deserve consideration. Let us give just consideration to the wants of those in the community, who are in unfortunate circumstances. Within recent months I have come into contact, in my own district, with a very sad case indeed. The misfortune of sickness and other ills had fallen on the home to such a degree that the family were left penniless through no fault of their own. The father had been in the hospital, and while there three little mites had been born into the home, although the word "home" is scarcely a proper description, for it was merely a kind of shelter, and very inadequate at that. There was a family besides the three new arrivals, and all were absolutely without food and clothing beyond that which resulted from the benevolence of their fellow citizens. There ought to be some provision to meet such cases as that.

Mr. PROWSE.—Certainly, but why introduce a measure of the kind proposed?

Mr. MAKIN.—I am asking the honorable member to give his support to the principle, leaving it to the Government to frame legislation providing the necessary safeguards against the possible imposition that has been suggested. Candidly, I would prefer a general scheme of national insurance in the case of life,

sickness, or unemployment, which would, I think, carry out the wishes of the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney).

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member is a young man, and I warn him to be careful in discussing national insurance. When we suggested such a thing we were denounced all over the country as being against old-age pensions.

Mr. MAKIN.—I can allow the honorable member for Melbourne in his reply to refresh the memory of the Treasurer on that point. In every community there are people placed in unfortunate circumstances, because of sickness and unemployment; and I do not think that any man worthy of the name would desire to accept charity unless it was absolutely necessary for the support of his wife and dependants. My fellow citizens have, I think, a keen desire to give a *quid pro quo* for any assistance rendered to them; and, in my opinion, only a very small percentage of them would seek to impose on the public funds. However, the fact that there might be imposition does not justify opposition to a measure of the kind suggested; at any rate, we should not neglect those who are deserving of consideration on any such ground. I have a knowledge of the poorer classes of the community in my own district and elsewhere, and I wish to do something to help those who cannot help themselves.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Have you ever considered ways and means? We are spending £5,300,000 on old-age and invalid pensions, and the present proposal, if carried out, would more than double that.

Mr. MAKIN.—I suppose that arguments in regard to inadequacy of financial resource were used against the proposal to institute old-age and invalid pensions, and also the maternity grant. In Australia, with our vast resources, we need have no very great fear about financial difficulties such as a number of honorable members have suggested. If we had sufficient acumen to manage the affairs of the country in the way they should be managed, controlling more efficiently the wealth produced in Australia and providing employment for all who desired it, there would be returned to the Treasury more than sufficient to meet our obligations as a nation and the wants of our less fortunate citizens. It is not only the men who have to contend

with difficulties of the kind, but the wives and children, perhaps, suffer even more acutely. The wives have to make the greater sacrifices, and it is with the idea of succouring them in times of adversity that I support the motion.

Mr. JACKSON (Bass) [4.59].—If, as the honorable member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Makin) says, this is a young country with vast resources, there ought to be no such thing here as unemployment.

Mr. MAKIN.—We cannot help unemployment in cases of sickness.

Mr. JACKSON.—As to sickness, hundreds of thousands of people in Australia, by means of friendly societies, provide insurance for themselves, though, of course, destitution is a different matter, and is very often caused by sickness. The danger I see in the motion is that it would bring about a sort of "won't-work" section in Australia. If ever there was a time in our history when every man should take off his coat and produce something, it is to-day. I refer honorable members to a statement which appeared in the *Australian Mining Standard*, of 17th July, made by Samuel Gompers, the Labour leader in America, who says that the cost of living is not going to come down until everybody puts his shoulder to the wheel to produce more. That gentleman does not wish people to become wage-slaves, but points out that it is the application of science to industry that will bring about the cheapening of production and a reduction in the cost of living.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—Does he mention what is the cause of the high cost of living?

Mr. JACKSON.—Yes, he says it is lack of production, and I commend Mr. Gompers' statement to the honorable member.

Mr. MAKIN.—That hardly applies to the question before us.

Mr. JACKSON.—It applies to my argument that we should produce more, and that there ought to be no necessity for unemployment. I can point to scores of factories, within a very short distance of this House, which are crying out for labour and cannot get it; and yet we are asked to adopt a proposal that would make unemployment more general than before.

Mr. MAKIN.—You utter a libel on the working community when you say that.

Mr. JACKSON.—I do not. Australia is no different from any other country, and we have people here who will not work if they can help it; and, further, I

say this proposal is of a kind to increase that tendency. The honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) did not give the House any idea how his proposal was to be financed, or how much he anticipated it would cost. Before he went so deeply into the question from the destitution point of view, he should, I think, have been able to give us some idea of the financial aspect.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Especially as honorable members opposite, in nearly every speech, howl for rigid economy.

Mr. JACKSON.—Yes, and at the same time propose the expenditure of millions on a scheme like that before us. The Australian people at the present time are better off than the people of any nation in the world. Living is cheaper here than elsewhere, and during the years of the war we suffered no hardship whatever in the matter of food, though every other country did. Until the honorable member for Melbourne informs us how he proposes his scheme can be financed, I cannot alter my opinion that, if carried into effect, it would prove a bad one for Australia.

Mr. RILEY (South Sydney) [5.5].—I support the motion. I cannot understand the contention of the honorable member for Bass (Mr. Jackson) that the granting of a destitute allowance would bring about more unemployment. We cannot imagine any healthy man choosing to remain unemployed with a view to securing a destitute allowance of 15s. per week.

Dr. MALONEY.—And committing perjury to do so.

Mr. RILEY.—I have met numerous cases of men too old to be employed, and not old enough to receive the old-age pension, who are in need of relief.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Honorable members opposite are inconsistent. All the while they are contending that 15s. per week is a starvation wage for the old-age pensioner, and yet they come forward with another proposition to ration a man at 15s. per week.

Mr. RILEY.—There is no inconsistency in our attitude. We claim that the old-age pensioner is not receiving enough. Owing to the increase in the cost of living the pension of 12s. 6d., which was a fair payment some time ago, is a starvation rate to-day. The present proposition is merely a gift to meet cases of distress. The Treasurer (Sir Joseph Cook) raises the question of finance. We had to find

the money for carrying on a great war, and if it had continued we would still have to find it, and honorable members opposing the Government would help them to do so; and if another war should break out we would find money for it, but when it becomes a matter of assisting the pioneers who have helped to develop this country, we are told that there is a shortage of money. We ought to face the matter fairly, and determine to find the necessary funds. During the war nearly every firm engaged in industry has piled up huge reserves. Every morning we see in the newspapers that wealthy corporations have gone into liquidation in order to subdivide their shares. Having accumulated so much money, they can afford to give their shareholders three shares for every one at present held, and when they claim that they are not paying more than 6 per cent. in the shape of dividends, in reality they are distributing 24 per cent. on the original shares. They are covering their operations in this way. The vessels owned by the Sydney Ferries Limited being now three times more valuable than they were during the war, the company has been reconstructed in order to bring its capital to a higher figure, and on this higher figure the dividends will be paid in future. The object of these companies in going into liquidation is to evade taxation.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The honorable member and his friends are responsible for all that sort of thing. They go to the Arbitration Court and secure an award, and up goes the price. It is a case of a dog living on its own tail, and it has been going on for years.

Mr. RILEY.—The Treasurer has raised the question of finance. I have glanced through the Supply Bill presented to us to-day, and find that there is a great deal of waste in the Navy, which the right honorable gentleman so recently controlled. For example, for the maintenance of our fleet, £178,000 is required, excluding the provision for wages.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—That money is all spent on wages.

Mr. RILEY.—Yes, on waste labour. Instead of spending money on cleaning buttons and the wearing of white caps, and on teaching men to salute, and so forth, it ought to be spent in some direction in which it can be made to produce wealth.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—We were glad of all that discipline when the Germans were threatening us.

Mr. RILEY.—If we are in a tight position financially we ought to cut down our expenditure on the Army and Navy, on which, according to the last Budget figures, we are spending £1,500,000 per week. That expenditure ought to come down.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—It is coming down.

Mr. RILEY.—I am pleased to hear it. I hope that it will come down with a thud. There is no need to retain at the Barracks so many of the officers who have come back from the Front. We turn out the private and tell him to find employment, but do not seem to be able to get a large number of the officers off the pay-sheet. One way in which the Treasurer could find the money for the destitute allowance would be by cutting down the expenditure on the Fleet. Instead of having vessels moving up and down the coast wasting oil they ought to be taken up Sydney harbor and laid up for a while.

Mr. FLEMING.—What is the use of creating wealth unless we can defend it?

Mr. RILEY.—Within the next twenty years there is no likelihood of the services of our Navy being required.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—The only economy which the honorable member can suggest is to destroy the Army and Navy.

Mr. RILEY.—I do not say that we should destroy it. I suggest that in the meantime it can be maintained on a peace footing. Let me remind the Treasurer that, when he returned from the Peace Conference, he painted a glowing picture of the peace and harmony and good-will that would prevail among men, and told us of how it would be possible to cut down the great economic waste brought about by war. Apparently he has now gone back on what he then said. If the community is to derive any good from the war it ought to be in the direction of reduced expenditure on naval and military establishments. It is useless for the Treasurer to utter a hope unless he tries to act up to it.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—It is useless for us to try to act up to it unless some of our neighbours do the same.

Mr. RILEY.—We ought not to wait until the other fellow does it. We ought to do the right thing first, and then get

him to do it also. I ask the Treasurer to look upon this motion sympathetically.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Sympathy is no substitute for cash.

Mr. RILEY.—If the right honorable gentleman will bring forward a scheme the House will vote the money.

Mr. JACKSON.—If the Treasurer can find it.

Mr. RILEY.—I have pointed out that the Treasurer can get the money from the institutions which have been accumulating wealth during the war. These firms made no sacrifices during the war while building up huge fortunes. We ought to be able to get a few hundred thousand pounds from them with which to relieve distress in the community.

Mr. WEST (East Sydney) [5.15].—One of the objections of the honorable member for Swan (Mr. Prowse) to the proposal of the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) is that applications for relief may be made through union secretaries. The honorable member apparently regards union secretaries as persons to be dreaded, but it is a curious fact that this House contains more union secretaries than are perhaps to be found in any other similar institution in Australia. I had the pleasure of hearing the Treasurer (Sir Joseph Cook) proposed as the secretary of the Miners' Union at Lithgow a good many years ago. The honorable members for Capricornia (Mr. Higgs), and Newcastle (Mr. Watkins), and others, including myself, have been secretaries of unions, and it is time to remove the false impression that such persons are not fitted to be intrusted with the task proposed to be allotted to them by the motion. They are, indeed, in a better position than others to carry it out. The honorable member for Melbourne must be congratulated for his attempt to deal with the numerous cases requiring urgent relief in our community. His is not a drastic proposal. Surely no one will say that, in a community such as ours, any individual should be lacking the necessities of life. Whether the machinery proposed in the motion will achieve the object desired is another matter. It rests with the Government to elaborate a proper scheme. The principle advocated is one that finds support among the best minds in the community. The honorable member for Bass (Mr. Jackson) made some reference to "going slow." I invite him to study the *Mining*

Journal. A statement was published in a recent number to the effect that in 1913 the amount which accrued to labour for every £100 of wealth created by labour was 20s. 6d.

Mr. JACKSON.—I did not refer to the "go-slow" policy.

Mr. WEST.—The honorable member should be prepared to meet criticism, and to remember that his hearers often know more than he does about the subject under discussion. I invite him to compare the figures for 1913 with those of 1918. In the latter year labour received only 17s. for each £100 of wealth which it created, whereas in 1913 it received £1 0s. 6d. That suggests that there cannot be much "going slow" about the working man in these days.

An objection has been taken to the motion, that there is no money to provide what the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) seeks. There would have been ample money available if the finances of this country had been properly handled throughout the war. I have never lost an opportunity to call attention to the callous indifference of the Government, particularly in the matter of loans and loan money. No honorable member can say that there is not enough money in this country to warrant the payment of a destitution allowance. Within the past six months various public companies have increased their capital by more than £42,000,000. In ten years more than £380,000,000 has been set aside as the capital of different companies in Australia. Why are such actions as these being taken? It is for no other reason than to avoid taxation. Owners are disposing of their properties on all sides, and for that I cannot blame them, for it is only human. Probably I might do the same if I were similarly placed; but it is my duty as a public man to call attention to what is going on. Property owners are disposing of their large holdings because they realize that future taxation must be based upon a drastic graduated scale. The delay on the part of the Government in grappling with such important problems as those of finance and the necessity for increased taxation is only injuring the country. I did not hesitate to call the ex-Treasurer (Mr. Watt) a muddler.

Mr. FENTON.—Has not the present Treasurer (Sir Joseph Cook) indicated

that a sum amounting to nearly £600,000,000 to-day escapes taxation in Australia?

Mr. WEST.—That is so; and what a fine opportunity it offers the Treasurer upon assuming office! I wish that I had such a chance. I would soon get my brains to work, and it would not be long before the country would benefit. It should never have been necessary to inaugurate the latest loan. Unhappily, however, our finances have been conducted on a system of muddle. Before long, we shall have to stop borrowing. The rate of interest for redemption of loans is continually rising. When the ex-Treasurer (Mr. Watt) left for England I was convinced that he had been sent on a fool's errand; and, after reading a press cablegram to the effect that the Bank of England would not lend money at a lower rate of interest than 8 per cent., to prevent undue borrowing, I tabled a motion directing the Government to inform the Treasurer that he should undertake no loans and enter into no contracts. I am heartily glad that British money-lenders are so chary about lending either to the Commonwealth or to the States at the present time.

The purpose of the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) is most laudable, and I strongly support it. There is nothing like sufficient provision in Australia to-day to meet hard cases. In New South Wales the State Government pays 5s. a week in a case where a child has lost its breadwinner; and in several of the other States I understand there is a somewhat similar provision. However, this should be a Commonwealth matter. Some reference has been made to the position in which union secretaries would find themselves if thrown back upon their old avenues of employment. There are quite a lot of people, apart from union secretaries, who might have to face hardships if they were compelled to return to their former work. I can look back to the time when I used to see the Treasurer (Sir Joseph Cook) standing thin and miserable at the pit's mouth. I do not know whether he would like to go back to his old job with unknown possibilities. The honorable member for Bass (Mr. Jackson) referred to friendly societies and the assistance they were able to give in times of sickness. I joined a friendly society when I was sixteen years

of age, and I have never missed paying my contributions. I have had no help from the society, but I continue to pay my contributions, because by so doing I help others and because otherwise I might be accused of meanness, although I am entitled to exemption by the subvention scheme of the New South Wales Government. I think that good will be the outcome of this motion. We must not believe all the harsh things we hear about people. We do not always know the causes of individual poverty. A man often becomes destitute through no fault of his own; but even if the man is at fault my sympathies are still with him. I prefer to take account of what is good in him, and make such provision for him that he need not go about Australia hungry.

Mr. FLEMING (Robertson) [5.37].—I have listened with a good deal of attention to the truly characteristic speech delivered by the honorable member for East Sydney (Mr. West). But I take exception to the manner in which the honorable member, as well as the mover of the motion (Dr. Maloney), proposed, as it were, to sacrifice the whole of Australia to what might be termed "hard cases." There is a well known saying that hard cases make bad laws, and whilst I have as much sympathy with those who suffer as has either of those honorable members, I cannot wholeheartedly support such a sweeping proposition as this. We cannot allow ourselves to be carried away by our sympathy with those who suffer to such an extent as to endanger the whole future of this magnificent country. Yet that is about the position at which we are arriving. I draw the attention of the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) to the fact that this sort of philanthropy can be carried too far. I shall try to approach the matter from two distinct stand-points. To-day the commercial and financial struggle throughout the world is extremely keen, and the reconstruction that is taking place after the tremendous devastation caused during the last four years of war must depend on the relative productivity of the people more than on anything else. No nation can carry such a load as some honorable members are inclined to impose

upon Australia, and succeed in the struggle for existence. Because the struggle for existence of individuals and nations alike depends on striking a fair balance, and if we go to the extreme in either direction we are bound to suffer loss, and in some cases destruction. Consider what has happened in civilization during the last hundred years. We are living in an industrial civilization based upon coal and iron, and, naturally, by the aggregation of peoples which must necessarily follow on our industrialism, there is a good deal of suffering and want which could be avoided if things were properly managed. If we follow the trend of affairs, we shall find that this industrial civilization, aggregating as it does the misery of the world in certain portions, has centred the minds of all thoughtful men on the problem of how best to relieve the sufferings and poverty that naturally congregate about big cities. In the first place we established hospitals. No person with any humanity in him would condemn or say a word against those institutions. They have relieved a great deal of suffering which could not have been otherwise dealt with. They have preserved many very valuable lives; they have been a boon and a blessing to the whole of our social system. But there is this fact which must be weighed in the balance against them, namely, that they are constantly patching up those who are unfit, and sending them out into the world again to propagate their species. One law of nature which can never be controverted is that the lower the species the greater is its reproductivity. That happens in human nature along the same lines as in the vegetable and animal kingdoms. And if we continue developing the sentimental side of the human race, or of that particular section of the race to which we belong, we shall overload ourselves to such an extent that we shall not be able to prevail in the struggle for existence against those races which adopt a system which, while none the less humane, is more logical and intellectual. That fact is evident to any man who studies the sociology of our present civilization. There is a tendency amongst us to overload our community, our Empire, and our Western civilization in such a way that unless we are careful we shall degenerate and come under the control

Mr. Fleming.

of those people who do not allow themselves to be carried away to a dangerous extent—in our opinion, they do not go far enough — by an over-sympathetic mind and heart. That seems to me to be a real and grave danger. From the hospitals we proceeded to the establishment of old-age pensions. They, too, are a very good thing, because no one can but admit that our old people who have served their country well are deserving of help from the country in their old age. And the old-age pensioners are not a real burden on the community further than by their consumption of products, because they do not reproduce and increase the number of unfit that the community has to carry. But if we carry this sort of assistance to the extent suggested by the honorable member for Melbourne—who makes these proposals from the kindness of his heart, but with too much sentimentalism—and allow every person who is prepared to make a statutory declaration that he is in need to be not only protected and preserved, but actually housed and fed by the community, how long shall we be able to maintain our virility? What made the Australians so famous in the Old World during recent years? It was the vigour, independence, force of character, and physical and moral strength of our boys. How are those characteristics derived? They are due to the fact that we have not yet degenerated into the lines which it is so evident we shall fall into if we adopt the proposal made by the honorable member for Melbourne. Even the honorable member, with his big heart, must realize and admit that there are in the community persons who would live upon such assistance and never attempt to do any work. Everybody knows—and what is the use of shutting our eyes to the fact and being afraid to state it—that there are in the community people who are prepared at any time to live at the expense of their neighbours.

Mr. MAKIN.—We could make provision to exclude them.

Mr. FLEMING. — How can we exclude them under this scheme, which provides that any person who makes a statutory declaration that he is in want shall be housed and fed by the community? If legislative effect were given to the

scheme the Bill would require to be in accordance with the terms of this motion. No man wants less than I do to see suffering. I cannot understand that any man can stand by and see his fellow-beings, or even any being in the animal world, suffer without wishing to offer relief. But there is a point beyond which it is extremely dangerous to go.

Mr. RYAN.—Can the honorable member give an illustration of his argument from any legislation in any other part of the world?

Mr. FLEMING.—History provides many illustrations. We can refer back to the history of the civilization of the Puma-jaub and the civilization of the Incas and various other peoples. History shows that in many cases nations have fallen victims to excessive sentimentalism. The balance must be struck, and we shall be doing a cruel thing, which more than anything else will bring destruction to this grand young virile race of ours, if we overload it in the manner that is proposed.

Mr. Gabb and other honorable members interjecting.

Mr. FLEMING.—I wish the honorable member for Germany would give me an opportunity to speak.

Mr. MAKIN.—I think that remark regarding the honorable member for Angas (Mr. Gabb) was most unfair and should be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Hon. J. M. Chanter).—Before calling upon the honorable member for Robertson (Mr. Fleming) to withdraw the offensive remark, I again ask honorable members to assist the Chair in preserving order. There were so many interjections at once that it was impossible for me to hear what was said. It is unfair that, following a chorus of interjections, the Chair should be called upon to decide a question of order. If the honorable member made that statement, it was offensive, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. FLEMING.—I made that reply to the interjection of the honorable member. I did not wish public notice to be taken of it, and I withdraw it, as requested. We cannot afford to allow ourselves to be swept off our feet by a rush of sentimentality. To do so would be to damage the community as a whole.

Mr. RILEY.—That was said when the old-age pensions were first proposed.

Mr. FLEMING.—I have never objected to the old-age pensions, because I hold that the old people have earned them; but the motion leads us by the slippery path of sentimentalism to destruction.

Mr. CONSIDINE.—That is right. Starve them out!

Mr. FLEMING.—We are a civilized people, and no member of this community would wish any one to starve; but if we have the real welfare of Australia at heart we shall not overload our citizens for the support of those who are able to do for themselves. Competition is the law of life. Every individual, from the highest-placed man to the humblest insect, has to struggle and fight in order to live. If the need for effort were entirely removed, the strength of the individual and the strength of the nation would depart. It is because I see in the proposal of the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney) the cloven hoof of sentimentalism that I object to it.

Mr. MAHONY.—Has not the honorable member heard of mutual aid?

Mr. FLEMING.—We all believe in mutual aid; it is taught to us by Christianity, and our civilization is built on it. But we have to strike the balance between the struggle for existence which is imposed by a law of nature and the mutual aid theory to which the honorable member refers. The strength and purification of nations depends upon the struggle that they make to live. Sloth leads only to disease and to individual and national decay.

Mr. RILEY.—Then what is the good of social legislation?

Mr. FLEMING.—I do not object to legislation for the improvement of the conditions of the community, but I am against extreme measures.

Mr. GABB.—I call attention to the state of the House.—[*Quorum formed.*]

Mr. FLEMING.—We must require self-reliance of our citizens, and we must give them incentives to activity, and some reason to maintain their individuality. If persons are encouraged to rely absolutely on the State for support, there is taken from them all that makes for the greatness of the individual and of

the nation. By way of moderating the proposal now before us, I move—

That after the word “the,” sub-clause 1, the words “destitute poor of the country could best be relieved by a carefully thought out scheme of State insurance” be inserted, and that the remaining words of the motion be omitted.

Motion (by Dr. MALONEY) put—
That the question be now put.

Question put. The House divided.

Ayes	11
Noes	28

Majority	17
----------	----	----	----

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.	Lister, J. H.
Bell, G. J.	Maloney, Dr.
Bowden, E. K.	Ryan, T. J.
Considine, M. P.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Cunningham, L. L.	Catts, J. H.
Gabb, J. M.	McGrath, D. C.

NOES.

Best, Sir Robert	Mahony, W. G.
Blundell, R. P.	Marks, W. M.
Cameron, D. C.	Marr, C. W. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph	McWilliams, W. J.
Cook, Robert	Poynton, A.
Fenton, J. E.	Prowse, J. H.
Fleming, W. M.	Rodgers, A. S.
Poster, Richard	Ryrie, Sir Granville
Francis, F. H.	Smith, Laird
Gibson, W. G.	Watkins, D.
Greene, W. M.	Wise, G. H.
Hill, W. C.	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hughes, W. M.	Burchell, R. J.
Jackson, D. S.	Story, W. H.
Jowett, E.	

PAIES.

Anstey, F.	Watt, W. A.
Moloney, Parker	Corser, E. B. C.
Blakeley, A.	Bayley, J. G.
Page, James	Atkinson, L.
Mathews, J.	Gregory, H.
Mahon, H.	Groom, L. E.
Lavelle, T. J.	Mackay, G. H.
McDonald, C.	Lamond, Hector

In division:

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—It was decided by the House yesterday that a question has not been proposed until it has been moved and seconded. I point out to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the amendment of the honorable member for Robertson has not been seconded, and I ask you, therefore, what question will be put if the motion on which the House is now dividing be carried in the affirmative?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Under ordinary circumstances, the carrying of the motion that the question be now put

would require the immediate submission of both the original question before the House and any amendment; but as the amendment of the honorable member for Robertson was not seconded, the question that will be put if the motion on which the House is now dividing be carried is the original motion proposed by the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney).

Mr. RYAN.—Was the Treasurer in order in raising the point, in view of the disposition of the Ayes and Noes?

Question resolved in the negative.

Amendment (by Mr. FLEMING) proposed—

That all the words after the word “the,” line 1, be omitted, with a view to the insertion in lieu thereof of the words “destitute poor of the country could best be relieved by a carefully thought-out scheme of State insurance.”

Mr. BURCHELL (Fremantle) [6.10].

—No one doubts for a moment the *bona fides* of the honorable member for Melbourne (Dr. Maloney), or the largeness of heart which he invariably brings to bear on motions of this kind. I certainly think, however, that before we carry a bald motion, couched in these terms, without any adequate safeguard so far as the total amount of expenditure is concerned, it would be well to consider the amendment moved by the honorable member for Robertson (Mr. Fleming).

Mr. RYAN.—What does the honorable member say would be the effect of carrying the motion?

Mr. BURCHELL.—It is exceedingly difficult to say exactly how many destitute people there are in Australia or how many are, unfortunately, “insufficiently fed, clothed, or sheltered.” The number who would come within those terms would be great, particularly in the cities, and it would be exceedingly dangerous to accept the first part of the motion, and then say, in the second part, that the whole should form an instruction to the Government to introduce a measure to carry out the object of the honorable member for Melbourne. It was for that reason, when I first read the motion, that I drafted an amendment to omit the last words of the first paragraph, “until relieved,” with a view to providing that those concerned should receive the amount mentioned, to be reduced by 2s. 6d. a week for each adult, and 1s. 3d. a week for each child, until

the amount allotted became exhausted. I say in all sincerity that there are, unfortunately, some people who, if they get an opportunity—I was going to say, would “sponge,” for lack of a better word; at any rate, there are those who, given a chance to secure even the small amount mentioned per week, would do so.

Dr. MALONEY.—The honorable member must recognise that the number of claimants would be reduced, because there has to be a sworn declaration. It is all camouflage talking about invalid and old-age pensions.

Mr. BURCHELL.—The honorable member must not accuse me of camouflage,” because I have not as yet mentioned invalid and old-age pensions. There are many directions in which I should like to see the Invalid and Old-age Pensions Act amended; but I am not dealing with that matter now.

Mr. FLEMING.—The Invalid and Old-age Pensions Act is specifically mentioned in the motion.

Mr. BURCHELL.—That is so, and I must confess that I cannot agree with the honorable member for Melbourne that in this discussion the Act is not a fair subject for criticism. However, where sentiment is concerned one is naturally inclined to view with kindly feeling those in less fortunate circumstances than ourselves.

Mr. GABB.—The Treasurer (Sir Joseph Cook) has told us that sympathy without cash is not much good.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—What I said was that sympathy is not a complete substitute for cash.

Mr. BURCHELL.—There is much in that idea, but probably the honorable member for Angus (Mr. Gabb), like other honorable members and myself, is constantly receiving applications for assistance by people in unfortunate circumstances; and I can say that, so far as I am concerned, no deserving case has been turned away. I am not bragging in saying that, but simply describing the typical experience of honorable members generally.

Mr. GABB.—I was speaking of the honorable member's vote on this question.

Mr. BURCHELL.—The amendment to the motion commends itself very much to me. We hear from the honorable member for Maribyrnong (Mr. Fenton) a great deal about science and the scientific method as applied in different directions: and it is essential, however much we are

in sympathy with the motion, that we should examine it critically and ascertain exactly where it will land us. I was surprised and astounded recently when the Treasurer told us that the increase of 2s. 6d. a week in the invalid and old-age pensions means an additional expenditure of £750,000.

Mr. McGRATH.—We are spending more than that on military preparations.

Mr. BURCHELL.—I am not familiar with the actual figures referred to by the honorable member, but he must know that there is practically no military training going on now. If he is referring to commitments arising out of the war, I can understand his statement, but when he speaks of “military preparations” I take it he means military training, and I doubt whether he is correct.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—This motion would take a month to debate thoroughly.

Mr. BURCHELL.—I am inclined to think that there is something more in the proposal than meets the eye—something more than its simple adoption would import. I have heard the complaint made that the passing of a motion by a private member carries us no further towards the object desired. That may be so; and one of the reasons probably is that honorable members are apt to accept ill-considered propositions. If honorable members would put forward workable and sound proposals, undoubtedly the Government would be prepared to give effect to them. Prior to the last election I was asked to deal with the matter of providing pensions for widows and orphans, and on his return to Australia I was asked to introduce a deputation to the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) on the subject. I mention this fact in order to show that it is not new for me to be advocating anything of this nature or assisting it to the utmost of my ability. But while I am anxious to do that, I am also anxious that the proposal should be put forward on reasonable and sound lines.

Mr. FLEMING.—The honorable member does not wish it to break down under its own weight?

Mr. BURCHELL.—Certainly not. I want to give the proposition a fair chance of success, and I am surprised that honorable members who advocate State insurance should oppose the amendment

submitted by the honorable member for Robertson (Mr. Fleming).

Dr. MALONEY.—If the amendment had been brought forward as a separate proposition I should certainly vote for it. I have always advocated national insurance.

Mr. BURCHELL.—I know the honorable member's views in regard to national insurance, and how keenly he has advocated it in the past. He could hardly do otherwise than support it now. He will find that the second part of his motion is not interfered with by the amendment. I agree with the Treasurer that the subject needs more than five minutes' consideration. The honorable member for Robertson and I would be very much astonished if we found that our few words were able to convince the House.

Mr. GABB.—I again call attention to the state of the House. [*Quorum formed.*]

Mr. BURCHELL.—We have two taxing authorities in Australia, and as the power to tax the people carries with it a certain amount of responsibility, it must be borne in mind that the Commonwealth Parliament is not the only legislative body in Australia responsible for the demonstration of sentiment and the display of kindness towards the people. I use the word "sentiment" in its broadest sense. There is also a responsibility on the State Legislatures. Of course, the share of each might need to be determined at a conference such as was held the other day in regard to the one taxing authority. I could not let this phase of the subject pass without a reference to the responsibility which rests upon the various States as well as upon the Commonwealth. For the various reasons which I have outlined, I have the greatest pleasure in seconding the amendment.

Sir JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta—Treasurer) [6.28].—I regret that I do not at the moment see my way clear to accept this proposition without further debate.

Dr. MALONEY.—Will the Minister accept it with the elimination of the paragraph instructing the Government to bring in the necessary legislation?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—No; the matter requires threshing out thoroughly. It is a very big subject. Before we can deal properly and fully with the question of old-age pensions, we will need to adopt some system on the lines outlined by the motion and the amendment. It is a subject which, by its very nature and complexity, as well as magnitude, challenges the best thought in the community, and more particularly the best thought in this House. We would do well to occupy ourselves in the consideration of it, not in the hurried way that a private members' afternoon permits, but by inquiring into it determinedly, thoroughly, and in an orderly way, in an attempt to evolve a scheme which will help to meet the terrible problem afflicting the world to-day.

Mr. RYAN.—To which problem is the right honorable gentleman referring?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—To the distressed poor of the community.

Mr. MAHONY.—Does the right honorable gentleman think that we ought to have the poor among us?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I wish we could do without them. I wish we could avoid poverty.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order! The time for the discussion of private members' business has expired.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 to 8 p.m.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Message received from the Senate announcing that Senators W. K. Bolton, R. Buzacott, and J. D. Millen had been appointed members of the Joint Committee of Public Accounts.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE BILL.

SECOND READING.

Mr. HUGHES (Bendigo—Prime Minister and Attorney-General) [8.1].—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time. I need hardly remind honorable members that the industrial problem, which has been a very great one during these many years, has been intensified as a result of the great world war. The problem is world-wide. It manifests itself in every country. In essence it is the same everywhere, though in different countries it is manifested in different

ways. In this Commonwealth where Labour has, owing to organization, political and industrial, been able to exercise considerable influence, it has been a problem which has engaged the attention of the Commonwealth and State Legislatures for very many years. By general consent at the present time it is recognised as a problem which imperatively demands the attention of all citizens, and, if possible, some solution.

There was a time when, with others, I thought that industrial unrest could be, I will not say swept away, but rendered comparatively innocuous by recourse to those remedies which this and other Legislatures have tried. But we have been chastened by experience, and have come to see that industrial unrest is at once the price that the world is paying for progress, and the punishment from which the world is suffering as the fruits of a system which in the past failed utterly to recognise the basic factors of production.

I am not going to trouble the House with many more generalities, but I have always held that production was not a matter which concerns the individual only. It is primarily a collective function. Society is vitally concerned in production, both in its capacity as a producer and a consumer, and it is not proper that individuals—whether they be employers or employees is immaterial—should carry on production without regard to the welfare of the community as a whole.

Honorable members are well aware that we have had on the statute-book of the Commonwealth for many years an Act for the settlement of industrial disputes by means of a Court of Conciliation and Arbitration. They know very well what our constitutional power is in regard to industrial matters. In the early days of this Commonwealth members of this Parliament were under the impression that our powers were much wider than the High Court has since decided them to be. It is now quite clear that the powers of the Commonwealth in relation to industrial matters are covered entirely by the words of paragraph xxxv. of section 51 of the Constitution, which reads as follows:—

Conciliation and arbitration for the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes extending beyond the limits of any one State.

I need not remind honorable members that this power is a very restricted and unsatisfactory one. Very many attempts have been made to widen it, but unsuccessfully. Even at the present time the High Court, in considering a case, has delivered important dicta which seem likely to materially affect our powers under this section. These dicta, as far as I have been able to gather, widen our power.

Mr. RYAN.—Very much.

Mr. HUGHES.—They widen our power so far as it has relation to State instrumentalities. We need not consider this phase of the matter further at this juncture, but it is proper, I think, that passing reference should be made to it in order that honorable members may clearly understand both the foundation on which our power rests and its limitations.

Under the power given to the Commonwealth by paragraph xxxv. of section 51 of the Constitution, we have created an Arbitration Court with a President and a Deputy. This Court has done excellent work; but the present position of the Court is one of great congestion. The methods of the Court are now, and always have been, cumbrous in the extreme. Normally the procedure is, first of all, for the organization concerned to file a plaint. This, in some cases, means that hundreds of employers have to be served throughout the Commonwealth. The Builders' Labourers case is a glaring example of how far this can go. After the plaint has been filed, and the other party or parties notified, the case is then set down for hearing. The case may not come before the Court for many months. The present position of the Court is that there are forty-two cases on the list, and that despite the fact that two Judges have been sitting almost continuously. As honorable members are aware, unions have had to wait for very many months before securing a hearing of their case. In some cases from the time the plaint is filed until the case is decided a year and more may elapse. The hearing of cases is often very protracted. There are many reasons for this. One is that the Judge is necessarily unfamiliar with the trade or industry whose conditions he is called upon to settle. All this delay, it is very obvious, makes for industrial unrest.

There are two ways of settling industrial disputes. One is direct action—that is the strike; the other, recourse to some form of peaceful adjustment by agreement between the parties, or by arbitration. In the Commonwealth we have hitherto had recourse to the machinery provided by the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, with which honorable members are familiar. We should be doing the Arbitration Court a grievous wrong to say that it has not done great service to this country; but no one will deny that experience has shown that for many reasons it is not the ideal instrument for the settlement of disputes. Now, if honorable members contrast this cumbrous procedure of the Court, its ineffective and expensive methods of settling disputes, with the expeditious methods of such a body as the shipbuilding tribunal, they must admit—if they bring an impartial mind to bear on the matter—that Parliament would be wrong if it did not indicate in the plainest manner possible that it was of the opinion that industrial unrest was more likely to be allayed and disputes settled by such tribunals than by the Court. The tribunal in question has been in existence for about two and a half years, and has given about 286 decisions. That is to say, it has settled 286 disputes. And it has not only settled all disputes arising in the industry, but has maintained unbroken industrial peace in the industry. And it has done this in the face of certain conditions to which a great number of unionists were very much opposed. The basic conditions of the shipbuilding agreement were continuity of employment, piece-work, and dilution of labour. Honorable members know how strongly organized labour opposed the introduction of piece-work and the dilution of labour. Yet looking back over the two and a half years that have gone we see that industrial peace has been maintained. For all practical purposes, there has been no break in the continuity of employment. And having had two and a half years' experience of the tribunal the unions, now that the period is approaching when this agreement will expire, have requested that it shall be renewed. Sufficient has been said, then,

Mr. Hughes.

to show that the tribunal has done most excellent work. Its record speaks for itself. But not only does the Arbitration Court suffer by comparison with the tribunal by its failure to deal with cases expeditiously and economically, but also for the reason that it has been unable to settle some disputes at all. We have to face the fact that, despite every effort that may be made to preserve industrial peace strikes may occur. It is true that these may not be strikes within the meaning of the Act. The public, however, are not concerned with names, but with things; not with shadows, but with realities. The Arbitration Court has failed to settle some very serious strikes which have paralyzed this community. This was particularly shown in the seamen's dispute. The men made certain demands, and, as they were not conceded, they went on strike. A compulsory conference was called by the President of the Court. No agreement was arrived at. The President has laid it down that unions cannot have strikes and arbitration, and that he will not deal with a dispute until the men involved have returned to work. I am not going to criticise that attitude; it is very logical and very proper. But it leaves the community in a most unfortunate position, because when the President of the Arbitration Court says, "I shall not hear you until you get back to work," and the men say, "We will not go back to work until you hear us"—for that is, in effect, what they do say—the strike goes on and the community suffers. As I have said, and as honorable members well know, the Arbitration Court failed to settle this dispute. A conference was called by the Government, and an agreement was arrived at after a stoppage covering some five months. Then, in the coal miners' case, the machinery of the Arbitration Court failed to bring about industrial peace, and another tribunal had to be provided. This was, in one of its aspects, at any rate, under the War Precautions Act; and the coal-miners to-day are working under an agreement arrived at as the result of a round-table conference. That agreement is enforced by a regulation under the War Precautions Act which

precludes the employers from increasing the price of coal without the consent of the Commonwealth Government. During the past three or four weeks I have had no fewer than three conferences with the coal-miners and the mine-owners. The miners desire an alteration of existing conditions. The agreement itself expires, I think, in October or November this year. But the conditions of some of the lower paid day wage men are such that, with the high cost of living, it is, they contend, impossible for them to live on the wage they now receive under the existing agreement. They demand redress. When referred to the Arbitration Court they decline to go. I express no opinion about their attitude. I deal with the facts. They want a tribunal, and are willing to attorn to a tribunal subject to certain conditions, and to submit all their grievances thereto, including that which relates to the lower paid wage men. This Bill will enable us to appoint a tribunal clothed with all the powers possessed by the Commonwealth.

Another instance may be cited wherein the Arbitration Court failed to settle a *de facto* strike; I refer to the dispute between the marine engineers and their employers. The men would not go to the Arbitration Court. There was no machinery, other than that provided by the War Precautions Act by which a tribunal could be created. Honorable members know that for six or eight weeks the shipping of this country was dislocated, and many industries were most seriously affected, because there were no legal means by which the parties could be brought together. No decision binding on the parties could be given by any tribunal appointed under the powers of the Commonwealth under the Constitution. That dispute was settled as the outcome of conferences and by the action of the Government. During the war the Government was able to exercise powers given to it under the War Precautions Act to deal with many disputes and with many matters which, ordinarily, it could not touch. This War Precautions Act, about the genesis and exodus of which—

Mr. TUDOR.—There has been no exodus.

Mr. HUGHES.—There will be an exodus. This Act, concerning the genesis and exodus of which diverse opinions

have been expressed in this Chamber, will ultimately disappear. Many times I have said, and I say it again, that, in my opinion, any regulations relating to matters which are not clearly the aftermath of war and necessary to give effect to acts done during the war, but which could not be completed while the war continued, would be held by the Courts to be *ultra vires*. However, I put that aside. We are desirous of creating machinery about the legality and constitutionality of which there shall be no dispute. We are faced now with a position which demands action. It is useless denouncing direct action and urging men to seek legal redress for their industrial grievances unless the means of redress are ready to hand speedily and economical. In the case of the coal-mining industry a tribunal has been promised to the men. Whether the men will accept the kind of tribunal that the powers of this Commonwealth will give them is another matter; but certainly they will not attorn to the jurisdiction of the Court. Then the agreement with the unions engaged on shipbuilding is about to come to an end. The Commonwealth is faced with the position that unless it has power to create a tribunal which will exercise the functions of the present tribunal, the shipbuilding industry cannot proceed. The men will not work unless that tribunal, or one similar to it, is continued. That is one of the vital conditions which the unionists demand. In these circumstances, if there were no other reasons for introducing the Bill at the present juncture than the position which obtains in the coal-mining and shipbuilding industries, the Government would be amply justified in bringing it forward. But, in my opinion, our experience of the shipbuilding tribunal warrants an extension of this principle to other industries. I believe that tribunals of this kind, flexible, convenient, expeditious, and economical, are much more likely to promote industrial peace, and prevent industrial turmoil, than is the Arbitration Court as it exists to-day. I shall return to these tribunals presently; but when I ask honorable members to consider the general position of the industrial world they will recognise that something more is required than the power to appoint

industrial tribunals to deal with industrial disputes if we are to bring about industrial peace. It has been said that what is really necessary is that the parties to industrial disputes should get together. I think that that is a very wise saying. At present the machinery for bringing them together is inadequate. The parties naturally view each other with suspicion, and they have a perfect right to do so. The employers sometimes think that the causes of industrial unrest lie with the men. Nothing can be farther from the truth. The causes of industrial unrest are inherent in society. The honorable member for Barrier (Mr. Considine) mentioned that fact the other evening. If I may say so, the causes of industrial unrest are inherent in something even more permanent than society—they are inherent in human nature.

MR. CONSIDINE.—And human nature is the product of society.

MR. HUGHES.—Human nature is a very curious and wonderful thing. The inability of men to recognise that any cause but their own is founded upon justice has been a distinguishing trait of mankind from the beginning. It may be said, therefore, with safety that one of the best methods of allaying suspicion, and of promoting harmony, is to bring the opposing parties together. For all sensible men must recognise the fact that without the hearty co-operation of labour it is impossible to secure industrial peace. Further, we must realize that labour, not only in Australia, but in other countries, has now reached a point where it will demand that recognition. But as things stand now suitable machinery for bringing the parties together and for recognising the status of labour as a full partner in production does not exist. This Bill creates this machinery. Provision is made for the establishment of a central and of district councils, composed of an equal number of representatives of employers and employees. The functions of these councils will be of an advisory character. Their purview will cover the whole industrial sphere. They will consider the causes of industrial unrest, they will suggest remedies, and they will endeavour, either by joint or several action, to promote the peaceful settlement of existing disputes. Let me take a case which will serve to illustrate the usefulness of councils such as those of

which I speak. There is connected with the Melbourne Trades Hall a body which has been in existence for some time, and which is called the Industrial Disputes Committee. That committee has done very good, indeed excellent, work. It is composed of men who, for the most part, are not directly concerned in the disputes which they attempt to settle. Their function is to endeavour to bring the parties to any dispute together. They do not preach industrial turmoil, but strive to bring about peaceful settlements. But they have no legal status. The law does not recognise them, and they are unable to approach the Legislature direct with their advice. Under this Bill it is proposed to make use of such a body as that, and by adding to it a similar number of employers' representatives, to create a council—by whose influence and aids the warring parties shall be brought together, their differences adjusted, and the wheels of industry kept moving, or, if arrested, put in motion again. This measure, then, provides for two things quite distinct in their nature. The first is the establishment of Councils of Industry, whose business is to survey the whole industrial sphere, to consider what are the basic causes of industrial unrest, and to suggest remedies to the appropriate body. Where a tribunal is necessary to settle a dispute, this Council may suggest one. Where a round-table conference is desirable, the Council may recommend one, and the Governor-General will thereupon call it together. There will be one Grand Council for the Commonwealth and one District Council for each State, composed in each instance of an equal number of the representatives of organized labour and of organized capital or of employers. They will be given legal status. They will receive fees. Their business will be to advise the Government and the parties as to what ought to be done. That is the first objective which the Bill seeks to attain. Its second aim is to create machinery by which special tribunals may be appointed to settle *de facto* disputes, to prevent disputes occurring, and to call compulsory or round-table conferences between the parties concerned. These special tribunals will have a chairman mutually agreed upon, or, if the parties fail to agree upon his selection, appointed by the Government. At the present moment the Broken Hill dispute is, I hope, in a fair way to

be settled by a tribunal which in essence does not differ from those proposed in this Bill. The tribunal to which I have referred is composed of an equal number of representatives of both parties, and of a chairman selected by the Premier of New South Wales and myself. The machinery provided in the Bill for the establishment of these tribunals is very elastic, and is adaptable to all the circumstances of industrial troubles. Take an industry in which, perhaps, there are more possibilities of unrest than are to be found in any other—I refer to the coal-mining industry. It is obvious that it is vital to the community that there shall be industrial peace in the coal-mining industry. It is abundantly clear that industrial peace cannot be assured in this industry by the Arbitration Court alone. A tribunal which is composed of an equal number of representatives of both parties, with an impartial chairman, is much more likely to bring about an agreement which will be mutually acceptable than is the Arbitration Court. Honorable members, I am sure, appreciate the advantages of a tribunal upon which the parties who are charged with the discussion of a dispute understand matters first hand. Such a tribunal attached to the coal-mining industry will be a step in the right direction. But, obviously, one tribunal will not be sufficient to deal with the whole industry. In this Bill, therefore, provision is made for the appointment of local tribunals, whose function it will be to attach themselves to districts, or even to mines, for the purpose of dealing with local disputes as they arise. It frequently happens that disputes occur consequent upon the action of wheelers or of boys in a mine, with the result that the whole of the employees in it become idle, and there is no tribunal on the spot to deal with the trouble. In the shipbuilding industry, in which there are endless possibilities of disputes owing to demarcation troubles, the tribunal is at hand and deals with the trouble right away. I commend this measure to honorable members because it is one which by reason of its elasticity, the expeditious way in which it will permit disputes to be dealt with, the *personnel* of the tribunals which are to be established, and of all the attendant circumstances, is much more likely to promote industrial peace than is our present arbitration system. No doubt these tribunals will, to a certain

extent, overlap the Arbitration Court, but their jurisdiction is limited by the proviso to clause 15—

Provided that no dispute as to which a plaint is pending in the Court, and the hearing has commenced, shall be referred to a special tribunal.

All other disputes are referable to special tribunals. But clause 17 provides—

Notwithstanding anything in this Act, if a special tribunal is satisfied that abnormal circumstances have arisen which affect the fundamental justice of any terms of an award made by the Court, the tribunal may set aside or vary any terms so affected.

Mr. TUDOR.—Give the Arbitration Court that power to vary awards and we shall get along a little faster.

Mr. HUGHES.—We propose to give the Court that power. Honorable members may please themselves as to what they do with the Bill. I put it forward because I believe it offers an incomparably better means of settling industrial disputes than does the Arbitration Court. If honorable members choose to reject it they may do so. I have given notice of a measure to amend the Arbitration Act where the President has asked for amendment. But, in my opinion, the Arbitration Court, even when these amendments are made in the Act, will not provide effective machinery for the preservation of industrial peace and the settlement of disputes. These tribunals and councils are necessary. They will give organized labour a recognized status and influence in this country, and the advice of such councils will be most useful to the Legislature, and most necessary, because on the face of things the parties themselves must be expected to understand their industry at least as well as we understand it, to say nothing of the Court. The object of the creation of these special tribunals, however, is not to supersede, but merely to supplement, the Arbitration Court. The Court will remain.

Mr. CONSIDINE. — Will the amending Arbitration Bill make any provision for the contingency of an employer refusing to carry on his business if an award goes against him?

Mr. HUGHES.—I refer the honorable member to the Bill. An award may be perfectly just when it is made, but

changed circumstances may make a variation of it necessary. The appointment of these councils and tribunals is a recognition of the principle of the round-table conference, which, I think, honorable members, who have had experience of industrial disputes, agree is the best known method of arriving at a settlement. I have had considerable experience of industrial disputes, and I say unhesitatingly that the decision of a round-table conference is more likely to promote harmony and peace in industry than is the award of any Court. Such a conference is certainly more likely to give a decision speedily, for its members understand intimately the industry with which they are dealing, and so do not waste time in trying to understand details with which they are quite familiar. Honorable members will remember that in England the Whitley councils have been most serviceable. They, however, are not as flexible as will be the machinery proposed in this measure. There is no limitation to the power of these councils so far as the settlement of disputes is concerned, excepting those which are imposed by the Constitution. We cannot settle a dispute over which the Commonwealth has no jurisdiction, but as honorable members know very well, a very large number—in fact, I think, an overwhelming number—of disputes are brought under Federal jurisdiction. When this measure becomes law the powers of the Commonwealth will, of course, lack much of that complete control over industrial matters which it ought to have, but to the extent that it has power, those tribunals will exercise it. The award or decision of a tribunal will be binding at law and have exactly the same effect as an award of the Arbitration Court. When it has given its award the tribunal may appoint a standing tribunal to interpret the award and give effect to it.

I shall not trespass upon the patience of honorable members any further, because this is a measure which can only be dealt with effectively in Committee, when we are able to consider details. I do not pretend that this scheme is a panacea for industrial unrest. I do not buoy myself up with the hope that when this measure is passed industrial unrest will be *in articulo mortis*,

Mr. Hughes:

but I do say that the Bill is a distinct advance on existing legislation, and I believe that it will prove of infinite service. I invite the House to consider it most carefully and to adopt the principle it embodies. I shall be ready to listen to any suggestions made by honorable members on both sides of the House. It is true that the Bill is introduced by the Government, and is part of the policy to which the Government is committed by its election pledges, but it cannot be said to be a party measure, and I trust that honorable members will not treat it as such, but rather will look at it as I do—as an honest attempt to deal with the most vital problem of the present day. I can quite understand that the Bill is open to criticism, as is every measure introduced in this House; I myself could criticise it. It falls, for example, far short of those admirable methods of settling industrial strife that commend themselves to the honorable member for Barrier (Mr. Considine). It makes no pretence of following those principles of which Lenin and Trotsky are the chief banner-bearers. It does not provide for compulsory labour. It is merely an effort to provide machinery for making articulate labour and capital, to bring them together, to effect a settlement of their differences, to protect society, as well as the worker and employer. It is not to be understood as a reflection in any way on the Arbitration Court. But we are not here to bolster up institutions of any kind. We are here to do justice and to serve our country to the best of our ability. In my opinion the Bill represents a distinct advance. I hope it will commend itself to the House, and I earnestly hope that honorable members will be in a position to discuss and dispose of it with as little delay as possible.

Debate (on motion by Mr. TUDOR) adjourned.

INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY BILL.

THIRD READING.

Motion (by Mr. GREENE) proposed—
That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [9.0].—Although this measure has been before Parliament for nearly five years, this is the first time that it has reached the third-reading stage in this House. A

Bill with the same title has been passed by the Senate on several occasions, but the Minister tells me that this is a different Bill, and will, therefore, have to be passed by the Senate after it leaves this Chamber. The fundamental principles of this measure are different. For one thing, it provides for one Director instead of three, and even the new clause, as proposed by the Minister, on the subject of Advisory Committees, is different from the original provision. In the first Bill, the Government proposed a definite State Advisory Committee. I have never heard it mentioned during the debate on this measure that there is in existence now, in the Trade and Customs Department, a Bureau of Commerce and Industry, of which Mr. Stirling Taylor is the head. Under what authority is that body acting?

Mr. BOWDEN.—Will not this new Institute wipe that out?

Mr. TUDOR.—No. We are merely building up all the time more bureaux, more institutes, and more spending departments. I pointed out yesterday that certain Departments of the Commonwealth were taxgatherers, the two principal being the Taxation Department and the Trade and Customs Department; while, in my opinion, the other Departments thought that they could prove the necessity for their existence only by keeping on spending money. I eliminated the Postal Department from that classification, because it is both a gatherer and distributor of revenue, and serves a public purpose. Departments such as those of Defence and Navy are only in existence for the purpose of spending money, and apparently think that the more they spend the more completely they prove the necessity for their existence. I am very much afraid that that will be our experience under this Bill. Under paragraph c of clause 11 it is provided that the powers and functions of the Director shall, subject to the regulations and to the directions of the Minister, be "the making of grants in aid of pure scientific research." That gives power to pay out practically unlimited sums of money. The organization, in order to prove that it is doing good work, may be tempted to distribute more and more money, and to encourage scientific research into

many things when more important matters could well be carried out first.

Mr. MAHONY.—They may spend the money chasing blowflies.

Mr. TUDOR.—I do not know whether they will spend it in that way or in trying to eradicate the prickly pear. I was opposed to many of the provisions of the Bill, and believed that there should have been a conference before it was passed. I notice that efforts are being made, by agreement with the States, to introduce a uniform system of taxation—and I believe ours will, at least, compare favorably with that of the States—but I am afraid that, as we have passed this Bill, the State will not favour that co-operation and co-ordination of effort which some honorable members so fondly expect. At the first conference which was called in connexion with the proposal to establish a Commonwealth Institute of Science and Industry, the Prime Minister said he was not particular as to the amount of money spent on the scheme up to £500,000. He did not say whether he meant that that money was to be spent in one year or ten years. I believe there is necessary work to be done by the Institute, but the utmost care must be exercised in the appointment of a Director. He must be a practical man, and not a theorist, to extend, as far as possible, the work now being carried on by the Commonwealth laboratory under the Trade and Customs Department. It would have been a thousand times better to extend that branch than to set up an entirely new Institute, which may think that, in order to prove the need for its existence, it must spend money all the time.

Mr. BOWDEN.—The expenditure will be under the direction of the Minister.

Mr. TUDOR.—Yes; and under the direction of the House. Honorable members who have been here for some time know what that means. In some future Parliament a Bill may be brought down to authorize expenditure on the same lines as the measure which has just been handed to me, covering Supply over three fortnightly payments, and which the Treasurer has informed me must be passed at a very early date. I do not know whether money is allocated under it for the Institute of Science and

Industry, but I have no doubt that the Government will keep on paying the salaries and wages of those engaged there. I shall be glad to hear from the Minister, if he replies, what work is being carried out by the existing Bureau of Commerce and Industry, and why that body cannot be brought under this scheme. When the Director of the new Institute is appointed, will it be necessary to have a separate bureau of commerce and industry doing a great deal of the same work?

Mr. GREENE.—They are not doing the same work.

Mr. TUDOR.—It is all commerce and no industry, so far as the organization of labour is concerned. I remember putting on record the names of its members and the classes of business they follow. They are all of one class, and do not include one representative of labour.

Mr. GREENE.—If there are no representatives of labour on the Central Advisory Council of the Bureau of Commerce and Industry, it is solely the fault of the labour organizations. They were asked to appoint their representatives.

Mr. TUDOR.—Three representatives of labour were invited to, and were present at, the first meeting. They were at least as good as the representatives that we expect to get under the Bill which the Prime Minister has introduced to-night. I believe that the three of them were all ex-presidents of the Melbourne Trades Hall Council, so that there was no doubt about their repute and of their representative capacity, and especially their ability to represent organized labour. They said they found eighteen on one side and only themselves on the other. It was a six to one proposition, and, according to their story, they were made to feel that their presence was not wanted. It is a mistake to have in existence two bodies carrying out a great deal of the same work.

Mr. GREENE.—They are not doing so.

Mr. TUDOR.—That fact has never been stated in this debate. I thought I would not let this Bill go through without expressing my views on that question. I hope that the expectations of the Minister and of the Ministry generally will be realized, and that the Institute will

prove of great advantage to Australia, but I am very much afraid that a great amount of money will be spent on this undertaking which could be much better spent in other directions.

Mr. JOWETT (Grampians) [9.11].—I take this opportunity to make an explanation which I was unable owing to unfortunate circumstances to make last night.

Mr. RYAN.—Why were you unable to make it last night?

Mr. JOWETT.—A combination of circumstances prevented me, although I have to thank my honorable friend for making every effort possible to allow me to be heard.

Mr. RYAN.—When I succeeded, you voted to “gag” yourself.

Mr. JOWETT.—Did I? When I endeavoured last night to have inserted in clause 4 a provision that the Institute should consist, not only of a Director, but also of six local councils representative of each State, I was interrupted, although most courteously, by the honorable member for Kooyong (Sir Robert Best), who said that such a proposal was utterly impracticable, because it would conflict with the other provision in the clause that the Institute should be a “body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal and capable of suing and being sued.” Later on, when the Leader of the Opposition interjected that it was only fair to say that provision for advisory councils had been included in previous Bills, the Minister for Trade and Customs (Mr. Greene) replied—“Yes, but the previous Bills did not propose to make the State advisory councils part of the Institute.” The Minister added that in that respect my proposal was entirely novel. I do not think the honorable member for Kooyong when he made his interjection was fully informed regarding what he was taking about, and I am satisfied that when the Minister made his interjection he did not know what was in the previous Bills brought in by this Government. Will the Minister affirm that the measure previously introduced by the Government did not propose to make the State Advisory Councils part of the Institute?

Mr. GREENE.—Part of the body corporate?

Mr. JOWETT.—No. The Minister's statement was: "Part of the Institute." I have a distinct recollection of his interjection.

Mr. GREENE.—I had a look at my proofs this morning. I said we did not propose to make the Advisory Councils part of the body corporate.

Mr. JOWETT.—For the information of the House, I repeat that, according to my proofs and my recollection of the interjection, the Minister said he did not propose to make the State Advisory Councils part of the Institute. Does the Minister now wish to correct his statement? If so, I shall let the matter drop.

Mr. GREENE.—Certainly not.

Mr. JOWETT.—It is only right, when I am charged with seeking to introduce a provision which is declared to be impracticable, that honorable members should know what were the provisions of the previous Bill brought down by his Government. Clause 4 of that Government measure stated—

There shall be a Commonwealth Institute of Science and Industry which shall consist of three Directors, and in each State an Advisory Council of Science and Industry, which shall be a body corporate, with perpetual succession and seal, and capable of suing and of being sued.

That was practically my proposal. I have no desire to pursue the subject further.

Question—That the Bill be read a third time—put. The House divided.

Ayes	...	28
Noes	...	14

Majority	...	14
----------	-----	----

AYES.

Bamford, F. W.
Bell, G. J.
Bowden, E. K.
Cameron, D. C.
Cook, Sir Joseph
Cook, Robert
Fleming, W. M.
Foster, Richard
Gibson, W. G.
Greene, W. M.
Higgs, W. G.
Hill, W. C.
Hughes, W. M.
Jackson, D. S.
Jowett, E.

Lister, J. H.
Marr, C. W. C.
McWilliams, W. J.
Poynton, A.
Prowse, J. H.
Riley, E.
Rodgers, A. S.
Ryrie, Sir Granville
Smith, Laird
West, J. E.
Wise, G. H.

Tellers:

Burchell, R. J.
Story, W. H.

NOES.

Blundell, R. P.
Brennan, F.
Considine, M. P.
Cunningham, L. L.
Gabb, J. M.
Lazzarini, H. P.
McGrath, D. C.
Mahony, W. G.

(Makin, N. J. O.
Nicholls, S. R.
Ryan, T. J.
Tudor, F. G.

Tellers:

Charlton, M.
Fenton, J. E.

PAIRS.

Watt, W. A.	anste, F.
Atkinson, L.	Maloney, Parker
Corser, E. B. C.	Blakeley, A.
Bayley, J. G.	Page, James
Gregory, H.	Mathews, J.
Groom, L. E.	Mahon, H.
Mackay, G. H.	Lavelle, T. J.
Livingston, J.	McDonald, C.
Bruce, S. M.	Watkins, D.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Motion (by Mr. GREENE)—

That the intervening business be postponed until after the consideration of notice of motion No. 2.

Mr. RYAN (West Sydney) [9.28].—On previous occasions I have protested against any alteration in the order of business unless adequate reasons were given, and I have been told by the Treasurer (Sir Joseph Cook) that it has been the practice of Governments from time immemorial to do as they liked in this matter.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I wish they could.

Mr. RYAN.—We have been told that the Government may alter the order of business without even doing honorable members the courtesy of submitting reasons.

Mr. GREENE.—I stated that I wanted to proceed with Order of the Day No. 2.

Mr. RYAN.—Why?

Mr. GREENE.—In order to get the Bill up to a certain stage, so that it may be proceeded with on another day.

Mr. RYAN.—The Minister might have told honorable members that. As the representative for West Sydney I am entitled to know the reasons for any alteration of the order of business.

Mr. MAHONY.—I want to know also.

Mr. RYAN.—Now that the Minister has given his reason I am prepared to assent to the motion; but I shall insist on the right of every member of this House to demand the reason for any alteration in the order of business. Honorable members come here prepared to consider proposals and Bills as they appear on the notice-paper for the day, and as a matter of courtesy the Minister should supply reasons when a motion of this nature is submitted.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

BUTTER AGREEMENT BILL.

Motion (by Mr. GREENE) agreed to—

That leave be given to bring in a Bill for an Act relating to the exportation of butter from the Commonwealth.

Bill presented and read a first time.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2) 1920-21.

THE BUDGET: ECONOMIES — FEDERAL CAPITAL AND SEAT OF GOVERNMENT— THE TARIFF—TAXATION OF WEALTH: STATE SECURITIES — INCOME TAX EXEMPTION — POSTAL DEPARTMENT: RETURNED SOLDIERS AND PROMOTION BY EXAMINATION—DEFENCE DEPARTMENT: WAGES—WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY —NAURU ISLAND AGREEMENT—REQUISITIONING OF SHIPS: LOSSES.

In Committee of Supply:

Sir JOSEPH COOK (Parramatta—Treasurer) [9.30].—I move—

That there be granted to His Majesty for and towards defraying the services of the year 1920-21, a sum not exceeding £2,367,826.

This is a Supply Bill for one month, but the amount is a little larger than was asked for on the last occasion, when £1,838,847 was required, because it covers three instead of two fortnightly payments. It provides for the payment of salaries on the 3rd September. That has been done to avoid the introduction of another Supply Bill before the end of August. There are no new items; the Bill simply grants Supply for the ordinary services for one month, in anticipation of the Estimates. The amount asked for is made up of the following items:—Ordinary expenditure, £1,400,301; War Services—repatriation and other things—payable from revenue, £367,525; Refunds of Revenue, £100,000; Advance to Treasurer, £500,000.

Mr. JOWETT.—Is there nothing for Canberra?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Not in the sense that the honorable member means. The proper time to discuss Canberra will be on the Budget; I hope honorable members will not deal with it now. I am making every effort possible to bring forward the Budget before the end of August. It is not so easy to frame and shape a Commonwealth Budget as it is to frame a State Budget, because accounts have to be got in from every part of a wide continent, which makes the work more difficult, and proportionately bigger.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—I hope that you will let us see the second report of the Economies Commission before the Budget is discussed.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I shall be glad to let the honorable member see any of the Commission's reports, and shall welcome help to obtain greater economy in the Public Service. I hope to discuss the matter when dealing with the Budget, when I shall endeavour to show exactly what is being done to economize, and shall explain how the public funds of the Commonwealth are being spent. When the facts have been presented, honorable members will have nothing to feel ashamed of regarding the economy exercised in the Public Service. This is the first occasion for many years on which a Treasurer at the beginning of a financial year has asked for so modest a sum as I now ask for. It is, I believe, the first time for many years that a Supply Bill for one month has been brought in, it having been the custom of late to ask for Supply for two, and sometimes for three, months. I hope that the Committee will grant this modest request, so that the services may be kept going until our expenditure can be reviewed in connexion with the Budget.

Mr. TUDOR (Yarra) [9.38].—I am glad that the Budget is to be brought down early, and I hope that honorable members will have an opportunity of discussing it early, too. Budgets have been brought down in August and September, and no opportunity has been given to discuss them before practically all the money required for the year has been voted in Supply Bills. It must not be forgotten that we have the Tariff to consider, and that on some lines persons are laying out thousands of pounds without knowing what Parliament intends to do. We shall have to decide whether the Tariff is to be Protective, or merely revenue-producing.

Mr. RICHARD FOSTER.—It is producing good revenue just now.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—And we need the money.

Mr. TUDOR.—The Treasurer seems to have forgotten the views which he expressed in 1901, when the Kingston Tariff was under discussion.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—That is hardly fair.

Mr. LAIRD SMITH.—The honorable member cannot say that it is not a protective Tariff.

Mr. TUDOR.—It may be in certain directions, but as regards commodities that are not produced here, it is merely a revenue-producing Tariff. Men in business in this and other States are anxious to know what this House intends doing, particularly in connexion with certain lines. I know that after the Tariff has been passed by this Chamber it has to go to another place, and, although it may be amended there, it does not become effective until finally dealt with by this House.

As we are discussing the first Supply Bill introduced by the new Treasurer, I would like to take the opportunity of congratulating him on his appointment.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I shall need the honorable member's sympathy.

Mr. TUDOR.—I think the Treasurer will need not only my sympathy, but that of every honorable member in this House.

I understand that the Treasurer has stated that at the present time an enormous amount of wealth is escaping taxation.

Mr. WEST.—Yes; about £600,000,000.

Mr. TUDOR.—Is that statement correct?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Not that amount.

Mr. TUDOR.—I can remember a gentleman who was respected on both sides of the House often saying, "What is a million?" Apparently the Government of the day are not concerned with single millions, as the policy at present seems to be one of raising many millions.

The Treasurer has asked for Supply for only one month; but he must remember that he has already had one month, as Supply was granted in May before the arrival of the Prince of Wales. The amount for which he is now asking will take the Government up to the middle of September. I notice that there is a Treasurer's Advance of £500,000, and no doubt the Minister will give us some information as to the manner in which that sum is to be expended.

Mr. BOWDEN.—Perhaps that is for Canberra.

Mr. TUDOR.—No, I understand that no provision has been made in the Supply Bill for any expenditure at the Federal Capital site; and I hope that when that matter is brought forward it will be

in such a way that honorable members will have the opportunity of directly voting for or against the expenditure. I would like the Treasurer to say definitely when he expects the Supply Bill to be passed by the Senate.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—By next Wednesday.

Mr. TUDOR.—Then, if that is the case, I think it would be advantageous if the Senate sat occasionally of an evening.

Mr. CHARLTON (Hunter) [9.45].—It is refreshing to hear the statement of the Treasurer (Sir Joseph Cook), in presenting his first financial statement since his recent appointment, that he intends bringing forward the Budget by the end of August. If the Minister is able to keep his promise, he will deserve the congratulations of every honorable member. We have, however, had similar promises in the past, and, as they have not been fulfilled, one is somewhat dubious in accepting them.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I think we can do it.

Mr. CHARLTON.—I am glad to have the Treasurer's assurance to that effect. It is the duty of the Treasurer, if he possibly can, to bring down the Budget at the earliest possible moment to enable honorable members to discuss the Estimates in a proper way. In the past it has been the policy of the Government to go on spending the money and passing Supply Bills, and when the Estimates were being dealt with we found that the financial year had practically expired. It is unreasonable to ask a deliberative assembly such as this to adopt such a practice, and, as conditions are becoming normal, there is no justification for the Government to act in that way.

I desire to take this opportunity of placing before the Treasurer the necessity of the Government making some declaration concerning our Income Tax Act, as the time has surely arrived when it should be amended. Since the Act was passed the cost of living has increased by approximately 70 per cent., and it is time some relief was given to the poorer people of the community. If

at the commencement of the war in 1914 we fixed the exemption at £156 when the cost of living was 70 per cent. less than it is to-day, there is every reason why Parliament should amend the Act to relieve the heavy imposition which is placed on those in the community who can ill afford to pay. In many cases men are finding great difficulty in providing for their families, and we are still continuing to collect income tax from these people, notwithstanding the fact that it has been declared that the basic wage shall be £3 17s. 2d. per week, which amounts, roughly, to £190 per annum. If it takes £190 per annum to enable a man to live, surely it is not fair to say that for every £3 he receives in excess of £156 the exemption shall be reduced by £1. We have also to consider the position of single men who, under the Act of 1916, have an exemption of £100, which is reduced by £1 for every £4 received over that amount. When the Bill was before this Chamber in 1915 I suggested that the exemption should not be less than £200, and it should not have been. At present the exemption should not be less than £250, in view of the changed conditions. Already income tax forms have been circulated, and in the course of a few months the taxation officials will be making the necessary assessments. Unless the Government decide on an amendment this taxation will again be collected from people who, as I have said, are hardly able to pay it; and that is not a fair position in which to put them.

We are told that there is £550,000,000 or £560,000,000 representing income which is not taxable at all; and this means that there are very many rich people who escape. Of course, much of this is due to legislation we have passed here exempting the interest on some of the loans, but I contend that it is not fair to exempt people who are wealthy, and at the same time tax those who are really in destitute circumstances.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—We can only alter the position in regard to loan interest by altering the Constitution.

Mr. CHARLTON.—I know we have given our word in that regard.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I mean that constitutionally we cannot tax State securities.

Mr. CHARLTON.—Is the whole of this £550,000,000 represented by State securities?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—State securities represent £400,000,000 and our own securities £150,000,000.

Mr. CHARLTON.—I think that if the matter were closely investigated we should find that some of it is not represented by exempt income from loan—that possibly a good deal belongs to people in affluent circumstances who escape taxation.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I have no doubt that there is a good deal of income which never pays any taxation.

Mr. CHARLTON.—That does not detract from my argument that the poorer people should have some relief.

In my opinion the cost of the war should be met by means of a sinking fund created out of income taxation. I believe it was estimated that the raising of the exemption from £156 to £200 would affect the revenue by about 5 per cent.; and if the extension of the exemption to £250 were taken to represent a difference of 10 per cent., the amount necessary to make up the deficiency should be collected on incomes over that amount on a graduated scale; in other words, I would collect the money required for the purpose of paying the interest on the money borrowed to carry on the war, from those best able to pay it. When we were at war we all desired to do our utmost to further the interests of the Commonwealth and of the Allied cause, and we borrowed this money; and it is only fair that those who made money during the war should do the most towards liquidating the debt. It cannot be doubted that there are some people who made more money in consequence of the war than they ever made in their lives before. Those who follow the share market reports in the newspapers must see that there are many companies throughout Australia which during the last four or five years have placed large sums to reserve, with the result that to-day they are reconstructing. These companies paid good dividends while the war was on, and now, with the money placed to reserve, they are giving further shares to their shareholders. This plainly indicates that these companies have made more money than they

were entitled to make because of the war, and the Treasury ought to be able to lay its hands on some of it; otherwise we may look for disaster in the near future, or, at any rate, some trouble. We see fictitious capital being created in almost every business concern; and one result will be that, when the employees come to discuss the question of wages, it will be pointed out that on the capital shown only so much interest is being earned, though, perhaps, not a fourth of that capital is genuine, and the men on this plea will be denied a proper return for their labour. The people who are making all this money ought to be called upon to pay more than they do in taxation, until we reduce our war debt.

It is not fair that the boys who fought for us while we remained in perfect security at home should be called upon to pay income tax, with the small exemption I have mentioned, when they return to civil life. In my opinion the returned soldier ought to be altogether exempt, and I have a letter here from the Newcastle Branch of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League, putting their views on the point—

At a general meeting of this league the following resolution was carried unanimously, and I was requested to forward same to you with the request that you do your best to assist us in this matter:—

“That we, the returned men of the Newcastle district, emphasize our strong protest against the levy of income tax being directed against returned men; and that we, as a body, consider that we should be exempt from the claims of income tax from any amount realized by personal exertion up to £250; and that we request that further consideration be given to this matter, the result of such consideration to be immediately forwarded to this district.”

Thanking you for your past endeavours to assist us, and trusting you will take this matter up at your earliest convenience.

Evidently the members of the League think they ought not to be taxed for the debt incurred during the war, but they are prepared to pay on a basis of a £250 exemption; and I regard that as a fair suggestion. Time is fleeting, and unless the Government take some action these men will have to pay on the present basis next year. There are many people who receive assessment notices for £2 or £3, and are unable to find the money without allowing their other bills to go

unpaid. That was never intended; it was always thought that the tax would be collected on incomes over a living wage; and I mention the matter to enable the Treasurer to give some consideration to it before this session closes.

In the Postal Service there are many men who saw service during the war, and I have had complaints from them to the effect that they are unable to get higher classification. A little time ago the Postmaster-General (Mr. Wise) informed me, in reply to a question, that modified examinations had been arranged for the purpose of allowing these men to improve their positions; but I have a letter from one of them, who points out that he and others find it absolutely impossible to pass this test. The effects of the war on them are such that they are no longer able to devote themselves to the necessary study, although they can do the practical work with every satisfaction to the authorities. The letter is as follows:—

I desire to draw attention to what I consider to be the very unfair treatment I have received as an employee of the Postal Department.

I enlisted in 1915 having then completed about six years of satisfactory service in the Postal Department. I was with the A.I.F. for about four years, and then resumed duty at the Newcastle Post-office, in October, 1919.

I am now a married man, and receive an annual salary of £150 and £12 war bonus.

It had been promised that a modified examination to enable soldier employees to enter the Clerical Branch of the Service would be held on our return from the war, but, up to the present, I understand only one has been held, and that one some years ago.

I have certainly suffered because of my loyalty to my country. Four years of service have not improved my chances of promotion. I am receiving considerably less than the living wage. Had I stayed at home, I would have had many opportunities of securing promotion within and without the Service.

I have wondered if you would be good enough to draw attention in the House to these facts. Perhaps you would compare our position, and the treatment we have received, with that of the State school teachers of New South Wales.

In the case of the teachers they have received, and justly so, a rise in classification, which will save them years of study, and, in most cases, give an important rise in salary.

In the case of the Postal employee—even when his services, both in the Postal Department and in the A.I.F. have been satisfactory—he finds there is no promotion and no prospects.

I will be pleased to provide you, either by letter or at a personal interview, with any other details.

I do not wish to occupy your time with matters of no importance; but, believing that you are a true friend of "The Diggers," I am appealing to you, and I am sure that you will do what you can to see that justice is done to those who have loyally served their country.

I think that, when one's Postal service has been satisfactory, he should be promoted to the Clerical Division upon his return from the war without further examination, as in the case of the soldier teachers.

There is a good deal to be said for these young fellows who enlisted at about nineteen years of age, when their minds were such that they could sit down and study for the purpose of passing examinations, but who, on their return, after three or four years on the battlefield, subject to all the disabilities of war, find it impossible, generally speaking, to settle down to studies. The result is that they cannot pass their examinations. If they can do the practical work required of them, we ought to be able to make some provision for them. Otherwise they will be obliged to remain in their present positions without any chance of rising. I do not claim that they should receive preference, and be put over others who are equally capable, but we should not impose upon them the necessity to pass the examination we would expect them to pass if they had not gone to the war. We ought to let these returned men know that we are desirous of doing all we can for them. They are beginning to believe that we have forgotten them. But that is a mistaken idea on their part. We have not forgotten them. Their difficulty is that their sufferings do not come prominently before us. I ask Ministers to take their cases into consideration, and endeavour to deal fairly with them.

I trust that the Budget will be brought down in reasonable time, and that honourable members will have an opportunity of dealing with the Estimates, so that once more we may be a responsible Parliament, which we have not been for the last five or six years. We have been governed by Departments and Executive acts. A return to responsible government can only be brought about by allowing no expenditure before it is approved by the House.

Mr. MARR (Parkes) [10.51.—For some time past I have been complaining that, in the opinion of the public the pay of men permanently employed in the Defence Department in New South Wales is

not commensurate with the duties performed by them. I was pleased to receive a reply from a Minister to the effect that the scale had been altered as from the 1st May. Whether it will meet with the wishes of the men I cannot say, but cases have come under my notice in which a fair living wage has not been paid. A watchman in charge of ordnance stores worth hundreds of thousands of pounds, a permanent man with seventeen years' service, is paid £3 2s. per week, whereas seven or eight men temporarily employed are receiving the New South Wales standard wage of £3 17s. per week. Saddlers employed by the Defence Department are not receiving the wages they ought to be paid. In fact, instead of being the best paid in Australia, the Commonwealth Service is the worst paid. In New South Wales during the last two years there have been sixty-four resignations per month in the Commonwealth Service, and they are the best men, and not the worst, who are leaving.

In Australia we are not paying to wireless telegraphy the attention it should receive. Recently there has been a good deal of talk in the House about the application of science to industry; but although no science has advanced more rapidly than has the development of wireless telegraphy and wireless telephony during the last few years, we in Australia are not making use of it to the extent to which it is employed in other parts of the world. The results achieved during the war in handling this science and the advances made were astounding. In Australia we are years behind the times, but we cannot anticipate any progress in this direction until this branch of work is controlled by a separate Department. I am opposed, generally speaking, to the establishment of new Government Departments; but I make an exception in regard to wireless telegraphy. It should be the work of a distinct Department. For economy's sake the accountancy work of such a Department might easily be done by the Post and Telegraph Department, the Navy Department, or any other already established branch of the service. At present the Defence Department, the Navy Department, and the Navigation Department deal with wireless telegraphy. The regulations under the Navigation Act, controlling the use of wireless telegraphy on ships, are rotten, and frequently conflict with the provisions of the Wireless Telegraphy Act.

Vessels can go to sea and flout the Department, simply because the regulations do not make provision for everything that ought to be covered. On some of the biggest liners leaving our ports the aerials spread between the masts and the feeder wires foul the funnel. There is often a piece of rope to keep them away from the funnel, but in some cases this rope is tied to a lifeboat. If the ship should get into difficulty this rope has to be cut in order to release the lifeboat, immediately causing the feeder wires to get foul of the funnel, and thus straightway the wireless is out of action. However, I shall deal with this matter when speaking on the Navigation Bill.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer, which I am sure is very dear to the hearts of many members of this House, and that is the building of the Federal Capital. When we come to consider the Estimates for the Department that has control of work at the Federal Capital, it is my intention to move that the vote for that Department be reduced by the sum of £1 as a protest against the omission from this Supply Bill of a vote sufficient to begin the erection of the necessary buildings to enable the Seat of Government to be transferred to Canberra. I have noticed that there is a vote set down in connexion with the Works and Railways Department for the erection of a note-printing establishment in Melbourne. I shall oppose in every way that I can the expenditure of any more money upon the erection of Commonwealth buildings in Melbourne. If we are to house our departmental officers in permanent buildings, these buildings should be erected at the Federal Capital.

Mr. RYAN.—The honorable member's announcement is tantamount to a vote of want of confidence in the Government.

Mr. MARR.—We often hear that the electors are above Parliament. Honorable members admit that at least one day in every three years, but I should like to say that I made definite pledges to my constituents in connexion with these matters, and I intend to adhere to those pledges. The erection of the Federal Capital is not a matter by which New South Wales is going to benefit. It is Australia that will benefit by the building of the Capital. The great war through which we have passed was brought about

because one nation refused to honor a treaty it had made, and treated it as a scrap of paper. If the Commonwealth Parliament is going to treat the agreement made with the people of Australia, and not merely with the people of New South Wales, to establish the Federal Capital as a scrap of paper, my voice will be raised against it. I do not say that Canberra is the best place for the Federal Capital, but that is a matter that has already been decided by the Australian Parliament.

Mr. BRENNAN.—Will the building of the Capital reduce the cost of living?

Mr. MARR.—It will reduce the cost of government to the people of Australia. We are now paying £80,000 a year in interest on money that has already been expended at Canberra.

Mr. BRENNAN.—How long will it take the Federal Capital to become self-supporting.

Mr. MARR.—It will become self-supporting almost immediately. We are at the present time paying in the shape of rent for buildings in Melbourne to house Commonwealth officials approximately £30,000 a year.

Mr. JOWETT.—Does the honorable member imagine that that amount would be saved by transferring the Seat of Government to Canberra?

Mr. MARR.—No, but that amount would represent interest on a capital expenditure sufficient for the erection of buildings in the Federal Territory where it should not be forgotten the Commonwealth owns 900 square miles of country. A most important feature of this question is that we can never expect to inculcate an Australian sentiment in the minds of our people unless the Federal Parliament is removed from the influence of the parochialism of any city. I should like honorable members to have been associated for a number of years with the men of the Australian Imperial Force. No matter from what State they came they were always Australians, and not Victorian, New South Welshmen or men of any other State. It was most galling for members of the Australian Imperial Force upon their return from the war to find, when they got to Melbourne, that the people of this city were jealous of Sydney, and to find, when they got to Sydney, that

the people of that city were jealous of Melbourne. I do not hold a brief for Sydney any more than for Melbourne, and I should not personally give a vote to transfer the Seat of Government to Sydney. The same influences that are at work in Melbourne to-day would be at work in Sydney if the Seat of Government were transferred to that city. I repeat that when we come to consider the Estimates of the Department concerned I shall move that they be reduced by £1 as a protest against the omission from this Supply Bill of a vote sufficient to make a start with the buildings necessary at the Federal Capital. If we are to start building the Federal Capital we must have workmen to carry out the work, and it would never do to send workmen there at the present time and expect them to put up with hovels or to be accommodated in a concentration camp. We should make provision for decently housing the necessary workmen and their families at Canberra. If we gave them an assurance of, say, five years' work I have no doubt that many would be prepared to settle down there comfortably, and land could be leased to them. The capital value of land in the Territory would, as a consequence, go up immediately. Although we have 900 square miles of country in the Federal Territory, the income derived from that area at the present time is a very insignificant amount.

Mr. RYAN (West Sydney) [10.18].—I was going to ask the Treasurer (Sir Joseph Cook) how long he proposed to sit this evening after the announcement made by the honorable member who has just resumed his seat. I have some observations to make, but I do not propose to make them at this moment. I wish to indicate to the Treasurer that, if it depended upon me, instead of getting Supply for a month he would not get Supply for twenty-four hours. I shall take the opportunity of stating my reasons at a later stage. I think that the manner in which the government of the country is being carried on in the hands of the present Ministers would entirely justify me in voting against giving them Supply to the extent of £1. I wish them to know at once that if it depended on my vote they would not get 1s. for Supply.

I should like to ascertain from the Treasurer, amongst other things, whether there is in this Bill any authority pro-

posed for the payment of money in connexion with the purchase of Nauru Island.

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—No!

Mr. RYAN.—Then, under what authority was the payment mentioned in the press, and referred to in this House, made?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—Under the authority of the Bill.

Mr. RYAN.—There is no authority in the Bill; there is no appropriation; there is no authority to pay the moneys which have been paid over.

I would like to know, further, if there is any authority contained in this Bill for the payment of moneys under a War Precautions regulation gazetted on the 7th July. That regulation gives authority to charge losses made in connexion with the requisitioning of ships by the Commonwealth Government to Consolidated Revenue—to moneys appropriated by Parliament. In respect to this matter, I desire definite information. It has been stated that during the period in which the ships were held up on account of the dispute with the seamen, the losses occasioned by the holding up of the vessels were borne by the taxpayers of Australia, while, at the same time, the ship-owners were receiving profits equal, or almost equal, to those which they would have received had the ships been running. Is there any foundation for that statement?

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—I cannot say. I would prefer to answer that to-morrow. However, there is nothing in this Bill relating to that matter.

Mr. RYAN.—I did not think there was, but I asked in order to make sure. Although there is no reference in this Bill, I want to know where the authority is, and it is only in debating this Bill that I can raise the question. I want to know, in the first place, what is in the Bill and what is not in the Bill.

Mr. BRENNAN.—That should be broad enough to cover the whole business.

Mr. RYAN.—I want to know what payments are not included in this Bill, and I want to know—if they are not included here—under what authority the payments have been made. I would be obliged if the Treasurer would furnish me with some information to-morrow which will enable me to discuss these matters on the basis of facts supplied.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT.

RETURNED SAILORS AND SOLDIERS IMPERIAL LEAGUE: CONTROL OF DISTRIBUTION OF SOLDIERS' TWEED.

Motion (by Sir JOSEPH COOK) proposed—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CHARLTON (Hunter) [10.26].—

I asked a question on 8th July regarding the position of soldiers who were not members of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League, and who wished to participate in the distribution of Anzac tweed. I was informed, in effect, that there was no foundation for the allegation that returned men who are not members of the League are precluded from securing cloth. I have nothing whatever against the League, but merely wish to see even-handed justice meted out to every man, irrespective of whether he is a member of the League or not. If the Government is providing cloth, every man who served abroad should have an equal and perfect right to secure a suit-length if he so desires. Since receiving the official answer to my question, a returned soldier, who was a lieutenant, and who is not a member of the League, sent me a letter pointing out that what I had suggested was absolutely correct. He says—

I saw the party in charge, and I put to him a plain, straightforward question, namely, "Is this cloth issued for the benefit of returned soldiers in general, or is it sent up for the use of those who belong to the Returned Soldiers League only?" He replied, "It was sent up for the League members only," and also that the League had placed £1,000 down for the monopoly, and, furthermore, he was acting under instructions from the League, and only members

of the League could be first served, at the same time politely intimating that when the League members were served there was nothing left over. Or, in other words, you had to become a member of the League or go without.

I have also received word from an ex-sergeant who made application at the same place, namely, at the Newcastle office of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League, and who received the same answer. I now ask that further inquiries be made in order to ascertain whether all our returned men are getting a fair deal. I bring the matter forward solely to clear it up, and honorable members will understand that I have no feeling in the position at all. I may say that in my district there is a league of returned men which is not connected with the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League, and that it is its members who have complained to me.

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE (North Sydney—Assistant Minister for Defence) [10.28].—I am greatly surprised to learn the particulars brought forward by the honorable member. The information which I gave in reply to his original question was supplied through official channels, and I was bound to accept it as correct. I will make further inquiry—

Sir JOSEPH COOK.—And if they have sold you another "pup"?

Sir GRANVILLE RYRIE.—Then they will hear from me. Obviously, there must be something in this complaint. I shall institute strict and immediate investigation to see where the trouble lies.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Members of the House of Representatives.

Speaker—The Honorable Sir William Elliot Johnson, K.C.M.G.

Chairman of Committees—The Honorable John Moore Chanter.

Anstey, Frank ..	Bourke (V.)	Johnson, Hon. Sir William Lang (N.S.W.)
³ Atkinson, Llewelyn ..	Wilmot (T.)	Elliot, K.C.M.G.
Bamford, Hon. Frederick ..	Herbert (Q.)	Jowett, Edmund ..
William		Grampians (V.)
Bayley, James Garfield ..	Oxley (Q.)	⁵ Kerby, Edwin Thomas ..
Bell, George John ..	Darwin (T.)	Ballarat (V.)
Best, Hon. Sir Robert ..	Kooyong (V.)	Lamond, Hector ..
Wallace, K.C.M.G.		Illawarra (N.S.W.)
Blakeley, Arthur ..	Darling (N.S.W.)	Lave le, Thomas James ..
Blundell, Reginald Pole ..	Adelaide (S.A.)	Calare (N.S.W.)
Bowden, Eric Kendall ..	Nepean (N.S.W.)	Lazzarini, Hubert Peter ..
Brennan, Frank ..	Batman (V.)	Werriwa (N.S.W.)
Bruce, Stanley Me bourn	Flinders (V.)	Lister, John Henry ..
Burchell, Reginald John ..	Fremantle (W.A.)	Corio (V.)
Catts, James Howard ..	Cook (N.S.W.)	Livingston, John ..
Cameron, Donald Charles ..	Brisbane (Q.)	Barker (S.A.)
Chanter, Hon. John Moore ..	Riverina (N.S.W.)	Mackay, George Hugh ..
Chapman, Hon Austin ..	Eden-Monaro	Lilley (Q.)
	(N.S.W.)	Mahon Hon Hugh ..
³ Charlton, Matthew † ..	Hunter (N.S.W.)	Kalgoorlie (W.A.)
⁴ Considine, Michael Patrick ..	Barrier (N.S.W.)	Mahony, William George ..
Cook, Right Hon. Sir ..	Parramatta (N.S.W.)	Dalley (N.S.W.)
Joseph, P.C., G.C.M.G.		Makin, Norman John ..
Cook, Robert ..	Indi (V.)	Hindmarsh (S.A.)
Corser, Edward Bernard ..	Wide Bay (Q.)	Oswald
Cresset		Maloney, William ..
Cunningham, Lucien ..	Gwydir (N.S.W.)	Melbourne (V.)
Lawrence		Marks, Walter Moffitt ..
Fenton, James Edward ..	Maribyrnong (V.)	Wentworth (N.S.W.)
³ Fleming, William Mont- ..	Robertson (N.S.W.)	Marr, Charles William ..
gomerie		Parkes (N.S.W.)
Foster, Hon. Richard ..	Wakefield (S.A.)	Clanan
Witty		Mathews, James ..
² Fowler, Hon. James ..	Perth (W.A.)	Melbourne Ports (V.)
Mackinnon		Maxwell, George Arnot ..
Francis, Frederick Henry ..	Henty (V.)	Fawkner (V.)
Gabb, Joel Moses ..	Angas (S.A.)	¹ McDonald, Hon. Charles ..
Gibson, William Gerrard ..	Corangamite (V.)	Kennedy (Q.)
Greene, Hon. Walter ..	Richmond (N.S.W.)	⁶ McGrath, David Charles ..
Massy		Ballarat (V.)
Gregory, Hon. Henry ..	Dampier (W.A.)	McWilliams, William James ..
Groom, Hon. Littleton ..	Darling Downs (Q.)	Franklin (T.)
Ernest		Moloney, Parker John ..
Hay, Alexander ..	New England	Hume (N.S.W.)
	(N.S.W.)	Nicholls, Samuel Robert ..
Higgs, Hon. William Guy ..	Capricornia (Q.)	Macquarie (N.S.W.)
Hill, William Caldwell ..	Echuca (V.)	Page, Earle Christmas ..
Hughes, Right Hon. ..	Bendigo (V.)	Cowper (N.S.W.)
William Morris, P.C.,		Grafton
K.C.		Page, Hon. James ..
Jackson, David Sydney ..	Bass (T.)	Maranoa (Q.)
		Poynton, Hon. Alexander ..
		Grey (S.A.)
		Prowse, John Henry ..
		Swan (W.A.)
		Riley, Edward ..
		South Sydney
		(N.S.W.)
		Rodgers, Arthur Stanis- ..
		Wannon (V.)
		laus
		Ryan, Hon. Thomas ..
		West Sydney
		Joseph, K.C. ..
		(N.S.W.)
		Ryrie, Sir Granville de ..
		North Sydney
		Laune, K.C.M.G., C.B.,
		(N.S.W.)
		V.D.
		Smith, Hon. William ..
		Denison (T.)
		Henry Laird
		Stewart, Percy Gerald ..
		Wimmera (V.)
		Story, William Harrison ..
		Boothby (S.A.)
		Tudor, Hon. Frank Gwynne ..
		Yarra (V.)
		³ Watkins, Hon. David ..
		Newcastle (N.S.W.)
		Watt, Right Hon. William ..
		Balaclava (V.)
		Alexander, P.C.
		West, John Edward ..
		East Sydney
		(N.S.W.)
		Wienholt, Arnold ..
		Moreton (Q.)
		Wise, Hon. George Henry ..
		Gippsland (V.)

1. Sworn 27th February, 1920. — 2. Sworn 3rd March, 1920. — 3. Appointed Temporary Chairman of Committees, 4th March 1920. — 4. Made affirmation, 5th March, 1920. — 5. Election declared void, 2nd June, 1920. — † Sworn 11th May, 1920 — 6. Elected 10th July, 1920. Sworn 21st July, 1920.

HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS.

Senate.—C. G. Duffy, C.M.G.

House of Representatives.—W. A. Gale, C.M.G.

Parliamentary Reporting Staff.—B. H. Friend, I.S.O.

Library.—A. Wadsworth.

Joint House Committee.—G. H. Monahan.

CONTENTS—continued.

	PAGE		PAGE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 29 JULY.			
Death of Lady Johnson: Sympathy with Mr. Speaker	3076	Incidence of Taxation.—General Exemption: Taxation Commission: Star Bowkett Societies	3084
Supply Bill (No. 2) 1920-21	3077	High Commissioner to the United States of America	3085
Public Works Committee	3077	Old-age and Invalid Pensions	3085
War Gratuity Bonds	3077	Pension for Temporary Incapacity	3085
Public Service Administration: Mr. McLachlan's Report	3077	Nauru Island Agreement	3085
Customs Duties and Foreign Exchanges	3077	Maternity Allowance	3085
The Galleries: Exclusion of the Public	3077	Elections and Referendums: Electors in Country Districts	3086
Coal Shortage	3079	Relief for Mr. Deputy-Speaker	3093
Officers and Employees of Parliament: Salaries, Bonuses and Promotions	3081	Destitute Allowance	3093
Post and Telegraph Department: Country Mail Contractors	3181	Public Accounts Committee	3104
Passports: United States and Australia	3081	Industrial Peace Bill.—Second Reading	3104
Russian Nationals	3081	Institute of Science and Industry Bill.—Third Reading	3110
Post-Office Directories	3082	Order of Business	3113
Pay of Defence Forces	3082	Butter Agreement Bill	3114
Public Service: Admission of Rejected Volunteers	3083	Supply Bill (No. 2) 1920-21.—The Budget: Economics—Federal Capital and Seat of Government—The Tariff—Taxation of Wealth: State Securities—Income Tax Exemption—Postal Department: Returned Soldiers and Promotion by Examination—Defence Department: Wages—Wireless Telegraphy—Nauru Island Agreement—Requisitioning of Ships: Losses	3114
Naval Radio Service	3083	Adjournment.—Returned Sailors and Soldiers	
Sale of Khaki Cloth	3083	Imperial League: Control of Distribution of Soldiers' Tweed	3121
Ratings from Royal Navy	3083		
Returned Soldiers: State Assistance	3084		
Remittances to Germany	3084		
Compulsory Military Training: Assault at Broken Hill	3084		
Insulated Space on Steamers	3084		

COMMITTEES.

SENATE.

DISPUTED RETURNS AND QUALIFICATIONS.—*Senator Fairbairn, *Senator Gardiner, *Senator Sir T. W. Glasgow, Senator Keating, *Senator Lynch, Senator Pratten, and Senator Senior.

STANDING ORDERS.—The President, the Chairman of Committees, Senator de Largie, †Senator Duncan, Senator Earle, †Senator Elliott, †Senator Foll, †Senator Gardiner, Senator R. S. Guthrie, and †Senator Lynch.

LIBRARY.—The President, †Senator Benny, †Senator Bolton, †Senator de Largie, †Senator Gardiner, †Senator Keating, and †Senator Pratten.

HOUSE.—The President, the Chairman of Committees, Senator Buzacott, †Senator J. F. Guthrie, †Senator Rowell, †Senator Thomas, and †Senator Wilson.

PRINTING.—†Senator Adamson, †Senator Cox, †Senator J. D. Millen, †Senator Newland, Senator Plain, Senator Reid, and Senator Senior.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (JOINT).—Senator Crawford, Senator Earle.

PUBLIC WORKS (JOINT).—†Senator Henderson, **Senator Foll, †Senator Newland, **Senator Plain.

* Appointed 21st July, 1920. † Appointed 22nd July, 1920. ‡ Resignation reported, 22nd July, 1920
** Appointed 25th July, 1920.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

STANDING ORDERS.—Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, the Chairman of Committees, Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Charlton, Mr. Fowler, and Mr. Tudor.

LIBRARY.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anstey, Mr. Fleming, Mr. Fowler, Mr. Higgs, Mr. Lamond, Mr. Mackay, Mr. Maxwell, Dr. Maloney*, and Mr. McDonald.

HOUSE.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. W. Foster, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Livingston, Mr. Mathews, Mr. James Page, Mr. Rodgers, and Mr. Watkins.

PRINTING.—Mr. Bamford, Mr. Bowden, Mr. Corser, Mr. Fenton, Mr. McWilliams, Mr. Riley, and Mr. West.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (JOINT).—Mr. Bayley, †Mr. Charlton, Mr. Fenton, Mr. Fleming, Mr. Fowler, Mr. Prowse, and Mr. West.

PUBLIC WORKS (JOINT).—Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Bamford, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Mackay, Mr. Mathews, and Mr. Parker Moloney.

SEA CARRIAGE: SELECT COMMITTEE.—Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Burchell, Mr. Corser, Mr. Foster, Mr. Mahony, Mr. McWilliams, and Mr. Watkins.

* Appointed 30th March, 1920. † Appointed 1st July, 1920.